



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2023

No. 38

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. LUNA).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 28, 2023.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANNA PAULINA LUNA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House on January 9, 2023, the Chair will now recognize Members from the lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

KPMG AUDIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I have had enough with the Biden Department of Education's utterly dishonest accounting tricks. The Department of Education's 2022 financial statement doesn't have a leg to stand on.

KPMG, an independent auditor, stated that there were material weaknesses in the department's estimates regarding how much the Biden administra-

tion's student loan debt relief plan would cost.

The Biden administration claims that its plan would cost \$30 billion annually over 10 years, but this is assuming that the Department of Education has properly estimated the participation numbers. According to KPMG, the Department has no evidence behind these numbers, and these numbers matter a lot.

If these numbers are off by just 10 percent, then the cost of Biden's program would rise to \$400 billion according to the Congressional Budget Office.

Folks in the Biden Education Department need to go back and learn some math.

At worst, the department is trying to hide the true cost to taxpayers of these debt bailout schemes. At best, the department is practicing shoddy accounting again. Either way, this is a completely irresponsible way to govern such a major program.

It is obvious to anyone paying attention that the department hasn't learned anything from its past mistakes. It was assumptions like this that got our student loan systems into this mess in the first place.

When Democrats passed the Income-Driven Repayment program, IDR, they grossly underestimated the number of borrowers who would participate. This, in conjunction with the student loan moratorium, has led to a \$311 billion budget deficit within the Federal student loan program.

In other words, the Federal student loan program is already costing taxpayers a fortune, and the Biden administration's actions will make the problem far worse.

To put salt in the wound, the Biden administration's proposed changes to IDR will cost far more than they are letting on. While the department claims that its changes will cost taxpayers \$138 billion over the next 10 years, a nonpartisan student loan ex-

pert has estimated that the true cost could be \$1 trillion.

Senator Everett Dirksen said: "A billion here, a billion there, and pretty soon you are talking real money."

This is real taxpayer money.

Once again, the Biden administration is trying to pull the wool over our eyes.

As chairwoman of the Education and the Workforce Committee, I cannot let this pattern of deception and mismanagement continue. I will spend the 118th Congress doing everything in my power to hold this administration accountable. Taxpayers deserve nothing less.

DEMOCRATS PUT PEOPLE OVER POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA) for 5 minutes.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, House Democrats are putting people over politics by lowering healthcare costs and creating better-paying jobs.

We are cutting costs for healthcare coverage, capping insulin at \$35 for Medicare patients, and giving Medicare the power to negotiate lower drug prices. We expanded the Affordable Care Act program which will lower premiums for over 13 million Americans.

Just in my district alone, 62,000 seniors with Medicare will pay less for prescription drug coverage, and 29,000 people in my district will have access to affordable healthcare coverage due to lowered premiums under the Inflation Reduction Act.

Meanwhile, some extreme MAGA Republicans are threatening to cut Social Security and Medicare.

House Democrats will always protect seniors from Medicare cuts or Social Security cuts because we put seniors over politics. In fact, House Democrats increased benefits by 8.7 percent last year to ensure a dignified retirement for Americans who worked hard for

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H919

these vital benefits. Let me repeat that: They worked hard for these vital benefits.

This increase helped more than 80,000 people in my district who are on Social Security. That is more than 10 percent of my constituents.

These are retired workers, disabled workers, widows, and children who need these critical funds to survive. They have earned them. They paid into them.

Social Security and Medicare are a lifeline for our seniors and especially those in my district. We will always defend these programs, and we will always put seniors over politics.

We will never cut Medicare. We will never cut Social Security. We will fight for our working families until the end.

Madam Speaker, House Democrats are creating good-paying jobs for all our American families. Democrats have created a record 12 million jobs since President Biden took office, and we aren't stopping there. Let me repeat that: 12 million, and we are not stopping there. That is almost as many jobs in 2 years as any President has created in a 4-year term.

House Republicans are trying to undermine all this through bad lies and make-up stuff suggesting that President Biden has hurt our economy. He has not.

Republicans want to raise the cost of everything 30 percent while giving the wealthiest Americans cuts on their taxes. This is outrageous and just plain wrong.

While extreme MAGA Republicans hand out tax breaks to the wealthy, Democrats are focused on lowering everyday Americans' costs.

We will continue to fight for working families.

I am not willing to use politics over people. I will always put people over politics and always, always people first.

RECOGNIZING JOHN "BARRY" DAGENHART AS AN OUTSTANDING CITIZEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the dedicated service and call to the ministry of Dr. Barry Dagenhart who has served as a pastor for over 40 years.

Dr. Dagenhart grew up in Statesville, North Carolina, and was spiritually nurtured in the New Sterling Associate Reformed Presbyterian (A.R.P.) Church.

Graduating in 1979, he studied economics at the University of North Carolina in Charlotte. He also holds a master of divinity degree and a doctor of ministry degree from Erskine Theological Seminary. While at Erskine, he met his loving wife, Sarah Lynn Richie, of Fairfield, Virginia, and they were married on June 26 of 1982.

Dr. Dagenhart had the honor and privilege of serving on various boards and agencies throughout the A.R.P. denomination. He served on the board of stewardship and A.R.P. Foundation, as well as the Erskine College and Seminary Board of Trustees. He was also blessed to serve as the vice moderator of the A.R.P. General Synod.

He currently serves on the Bonclarken Board of Trustees, the conference center for the A.R.P. denomination. In addition to his service at the Synod level, he also has served on various commissions and committees on the Presbytery level in First Presbytery, Second Presbytery, and, most recently, Catawba Presbytery where he served as moderator from 2013 to 2014.

Not only has Dr. Dagenhart generously served on various boards and committees in his community, he also enjoyed being able to use his call to the gospel ministry to impact youth, adults, and individuals with special needs at various week-long summer camps at Bonclarken located in Flat Rock, North Carolina.

Throughout his decades of ministry, Dr. Dagenhart has frequently served as camp minister for Camp Joy, a camp for those affected by physical and mental disabilities. Dr. Dagenhart's caring and generous heart is what makes him stand out as an honorable citizen and follower of Jesus Christ, sacrificing his time to help those around him.

Dr. Dagenhart has an encouraging and loving family—his wife Sarah, son Jamey, and daughter Rachel—who support him in walking his path of placing others above himself.

Dr. Barry Dagenhart has set the gold standard for decades of dedicated service and commitment to his congregation and to the community. He will long be remembered for that.

Madam Speaker, we all join in saying thank you and Godspeed in his well-deserved years of retirement.

TOXIC WASTE IN MICHIGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) for 5 minutes.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the 12th Congressional District and the State of Michigan to say to Norfolk Southern: Don't dump your toxic waste in our State.

Late last Friday, we learned that shipments of solid and liquid toxic waste from the East Palestine train derailment in Ohio were being transported to Michigan for disposal.

Norfolk Southern chose to dispose truckloads of hazardous materials at multiple sites, including one operated by U.S. Ecology, one of our region's most negligent and notorious corporate polluters. These companies treat poisoning our communities as the cost of doing business, and we are done with it.

I am so proud of our residents who spoke up and who helped halt further shipments into our State. I want to

thank every single one of them from the bottom of my heart for speaking the truth and demanding better from all of our officials from the State and the Federal EPA.

We will never give permission for corporate polluters to continue sacrificing the health and well-being of our communities and our families.

Our environmental regulators State and Federal must aggressively protect all of us from this threat and hold these polluters accountable.

DTE ENERGY

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today to say that DTE Energy, an investor-owned utility monopoly in my district, charges some of the highest rates in our Nation while providing some of the most unreliable service and performs hundreds of thousands of utility shutoffs per year.

Right now many of my residents are in the seventh day of no power: no gas, heat, or electricity.

This past week has been yet another nightmare for more than close to 1 million DTE customers as well as 200,000 consumer energy customers in our State who have endured days on end without power and heat after a completely foreseeable winter storm.

Why?

Because DTE doesn't invest in reliability. It invests in profits and pays for shareholders and executives. The company made \$1.1 billion in profits last year alone.

Investor-owned utilities like DTE will always put profits over the people whom we serve in this Chamber.

During the worst of the pandemic in 2020, Madam Speaker, DTE shut off power to customers more than 80,000 times despite being subsidized by our Federal Government to the tune of \$268 million in CARES Act funding.

The reason?

They paid out \$807 million to shareholders instead of keeping the power on for our residents who were struggling through the pandemic.

□ 1015

Since 2015, DTE has received over \$775 million in rate hikes, the second highest rate of increase in our Nation, and they just announced their intention to seek another massive rate hike.

DTE has failed to invest in the infrastructure upgrades necessary to prevent outages, instead choosing to maximize profits for its shareholders and spending millions on campaign contributions to avoid real accountability.

I am sick and tired of wealthy corporate executives lining their pockets while our communities suffer and continue to be exploited.

That is why, last year, I introduced the Resolution Recognizing the Human Rights to Utilities with Representatives CORI BUSH and JAMAAL BOWMAN.

Madam Speaker, access to utilities is not a privilege; it is a fundamental human right. People depend on it for medical and for safety, again, in their

own homes. In the richest country on Earth, every single family should have access to electricity, heat, and water. We need public power for all.

HONORING THE LIFE OF EVA ALVAREZ

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today in memory of Eva Alvarez, a community activist who worked to improve the lives of countless immigrant families across southeast Michigan. Her life was suddenly cut short this past weekend in a tragic accident.

Eva worked on public policy advocacy for the Michigan Immigrant Rights Center, one of the State's strongest immigrant empowerment agencies, where she championed policies to improve the lives of immigrants, Dreamers, farmworkers, and TSP holders.

She was an incredible leader. Eva will be missed. She is known for her spirit of hope and optimism, which helped her persevere and remain steadfast in her work. She could always be counted on to offer a kind word to uplift others.

Eva's sudden passing will be felt deeply throughout our communities. Please join me in honoring the life of Ms. Eva Alvarez, and please extend our condolences to her family as we mourn her loss. May she rest in power.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF THE HONORABLE JAMES THOMAS BROYHILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, right now, family and friends have gathered in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, to celebrate the life of a giant of North Carolina politics, Jim Broyhill, who passed away last week at 95.

Mr. Broyhill served in this House for 23 years and briefly as a Member of the United States Senate.

His story began in the town of Lenoir, where he was born the son of James Edgar and Satie Hunt Broyhill, whose Broyhill Furniture had become a thriving business and brand name known nationwide.

Ed Broyhill, Mr. Broyhill's father, despite living in a State where the Republican Party was almost extinct, was a Republican national committeeman. Jim Broyhill listened at the kitchen table as community and business leaders and politicians discussed current events with his father. It sparked Jim's interest.

He attended and graduated from the University of North Carolina, class of 1950, joined the family business, and emerged as a leader of the business community in his own right. He married Louise, and they started a family, raising three children.

Like his father, Mr. Broyhill was passionate about politics. He also believed fervently in competition. More than anything, he wanted to build in North

Carolina a competitive two-party system. In 1962, he materially advanced that ball in a surprise election to Congress.

In the preceding districting process, the Democrat-dominated State legislature drew districts designed to eliminate the only North Carolina Republican in the State's congressional delegation, Charles Jonas of Charlotte, but the plan backfired and elected two Republicans to Congress, Mr. Jonas and Mr. Broyhill.

Once in Washington, Representative Broyhill formed relationships with members of both parties and learned how to be an effective Member. He served patiently his entire career in the minority as Democrats ran Congress, just as he patiently nursed political competition back home. He advocated for lower taxes and less regulation, but he set the gold standard in constituent service.

As a result, after that first bare win in 1962, he never again faced a serious challenge in reelection campaigns. Even now, North Carolina Members pay heed to the Broyhill model for serving constituent needs.

Mr. Broyhill worked across the aisle for more rational business regulation and served as a mentor to fellow Republicans in Congress, meeting one-on-one with freshman Members and instructing them on the importance of constituent service and attending local events in the district.

After his retirement, he briefly returned to Lenoir, and then served as secretary of commerce and chairman of the North Carolina Economic Development Commission. He worked hard to bring new business to the State and had a great deal of success.

Mr. Broyhill leaves behind his wife of 71 years, Louise; son Ed, who serves as a Republican national committeeman himself; daughter Marilyn; 6 grandchildren; and 13 great-grandchildren. His son Phil passed away, sadly, in 2014. In addition, he leaves many friends and supporters, grateful constituents, loyal former staff, and Members of Congress who followed him into this Chamber.

Just 15 months ago, I had the privilege to meet Mr. and Mrs. Broyhill myself. It cemented for me the larger-than-life figure of Jim Broyhill, who has long since entered the pantheon of foremost North Carolina leaders.

For all the care he furnished to the Republican Party as it broke one-party dominance in North Carolina, his first priority was Louise, Ed, and Marilyn, his extended family whom he loved.

Jim Broyhill was a distinguished gentleman, a humble public servant, and a loyal husband, father, and friend. It is my honor to pay tribute to his memory today.

Jim Broyhill, rest in peace.

SUPPORTING FTC'S NONCOMPETE BAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, our economy thrives on competition and freedom. No employer should be able to block their workers from taking a better job, but that is what noncompete contracts do. They strip Americans' freedom to work at the job that is best for them.

As a result, workers are losing out on nearly \$300 billion in wages every year. Companies stop incentivizing workers to stay because they don't need to. They are stuck.

Noncompetes also drag down the entire economy, hurting even those of us who aren't covered by them. Everyone is harmed when wages are suppressed, innovation is stifled, and competition is prevented.

I am thrilled that the Federal Trade Commission is ending this toxic practice. Banning noncompetes will promote the ideals our country was founded on—open markets, economic mobility, and the right to control one's own life.

Madam Speaker, I commend this effort to make our capitalist economy more fair, free, and prosperous.

STANDING UP FOR RENTAL MARKET FAIRNESS AND AFFORDABILITY

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to sound the alarm on the housing crisis crushing millions of Americans.

Skyrocketing rents across the country are pummeling families and squeezing them out of their homes. Let's face it, the rental market is broken and riddled with unfair practices.

Unreasonable background checks, crooked screening algorithms, and anticompetitive information sharing are just some of the many obstacles locking renters out from obtaining safe and affordable housing.

I am grateful that the Biden administration announced new actions to increase fairness in the rental market, protect tenants, and make housing more affordable. Rooting out predatory tactics and developing strong guardrails will help prevent future egregious increases in rent.

As California's watchdog during the last foreclosure crisis, I know it takes fight to keep families in their homes. I urge leaders across government to stand up for renters.

KEEPING AAPI COMMUNITIES SAFE

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I rise to address how our government can address the issues facing our AAPI communities.

Supporting Asian and Pacific Islander Americans requires recognizing the diversity within those communities. Inadequate data limit our ability to serve all Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders.

Federal data on AAPI people fail to capture differences across ethnic backgrounds. Grouping all AAPI people into one supercategory erases important distinctions in cultural traditions and lived experiences.

Blunt data instruments cannot produce targeted policy solutions to

the dangers AAPI communities face, like hate crimes.

In California, anti-AAPI hate crimes are up 177 percent, but some communities experience these threats more acutely. For example, a recent survey found that Vietnamese communities are 38 percent more likely to worry about hate crimes than other AAPI communities.

I am leading efforts to fund community-based solutions to anti-AAPI hate crimes, but making these tools even more effective requires data that identify at-risk groups. Official data must guide our efforts to keep our AAPI neighbors safe.

SCOURGE OF WOKEISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about yet another instance of the insanity of wokeism that is permeating our society, ruining our culture, and destroying our ability to govern.

This scourge has infiltrated academia, the media, and our corporate boardrooms, and it is now taking over our government functions, all on the backs of our taxpayers, those very taxpayers who recognize this nonsense for what it is and who are being plucked clean by an elitist cabal of eco-warriors who are paid to destroy the very standard of living that allows them to focus on made-up crises rather than to do the job for which they were hired.

Of what do I speak? The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has now begun offering eco-grief training for its employees. Yes, you heard me correctly. Eco-grief, a made-up condition that provides an opportunity for our oh-so-delicate employees who are allegedly struggling with a sense of trauma as they witness what they claim is a changing environment.

It is one thing for a private company to waste its own money, but it is not okay for the Federal Government to misappropriate our money to further a political agenda that is intended to increase the cost of putting food on your table, a roof over your head, and gas in your car.

It is our money that is being used for environmental activism instead of paying down some of our nearly \$32 trillion in debt. It is our money that is being used to convince people that the United States is evil, despite the fact that we have lifted more people out of poverty, provided a better standard of living, and provided more opportunities for more people than any other country in the history of mankind while at the same time using and managing our natural resources in a way that protects our environment and our sovereignty.

Eco-grief is admittedly a smaller budget item than many other woke programs. That, however, is no reason to ignore what it portends, as it is just

the latest made-up malady and another part of a larger scale assault on both common sense and American energy.

Biden's administration has gone to war on our energy industries by blocking the extraction, development, transport, and use of our abundant and clean fossil fuels—in other words, those energy resources that actually work, such as coal, oil and gas, and uranium.

They seek to make us energy paupers, thereby forcing the United States to beg other countries for the resources that we need to power this country and our economy.

Permitting is now longer, more complicated, more expensive, and designed to limit new energy development and production throughout every step of the process. Oil and gas leases have declined by 97 percent compared to this point in Donald Trump's Presidency.

Despite Biden irresponsibly tapping into our Strategic Petroleum Reserve, gas prices remain stubbornly high, and natural gas, a major source of home heating for half of America, is expected to increase by 25 percent.

Coal provides a quarter of America's energy. It is critical to manufacturing and is vital to not only my State of Wyoming but to anyone who wants to ensure access to clean and affordable energy. It is under constant attack by the ever-increasing and more restrictive rules issued from on high by the unelected bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

Who suffers? The citizens of this country, with the poorest among us suffering the most. I believe that there truly is a special place in hell for people who adopt policies that are designed to create energy poverty, a situation where families must choose between buying food, heating their homes, or putting gas in their cars. This will be one of Biden's lasting legacies, shared misery for everyone except the liberal elite.

Quite simply, we cannot afford the woke energy agenda being pursued by President Biden, and we sure as heck can't indulge in the latest made-up condition of eco-grief.

While it may seem that we are in a hopeless situation with a nonstop cycle of bad policies coming out of D.C., we cannot give up. With Republicans now in control of the House of Representatives, we must pass legislation to claw back power from the administrative state, and I am filing multiple bills to do just that.

Ultimately, the solution is in producing our affordable and plentiful American energy, but we cannot wait for 2 more years. Our citizens need relief now.

I hope that everyone in this Chamber will join me in fighting against Biden's war on energy. We must call out the nonsense and remind these unelected bureaucrats who they actually work for—the American citizens who have no interest in paying for their counseling.

For our friends at the Fish and Wildlife Service who may be watching this

speech, you may want to take that eco-grief seminar now, before we legislate it out of existence.

□ 1030

RUSSIA'S EXPANDED TERRORIST WAR AGAINST UKRAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, today I rise to mark more than 1 year of Russia's expanded terrorist war against Ukraine after its initial unprovoked invasion in 2014.

The words of Ukraine's poet laureate Taras Shevchenko ring especially true today as when he penned them nearly two centuries ago:

"... rise ye up and break your heavy chains and water with the tyrants' blood, the freedom you have gained."

Ukraine's moment to victory is now. The defining accomplishment of the 20th century was the victory of liberty over tyranny. Vanquishing Nazi and imperialist tyranny and defeating the forces of Soviet-imposed communism a half century later ended the Cold War.

New institutions for the common defense of liberty, including NATO, were founded. The U.S. Marshall Plan helped to secure and rebuild a war-torn but free Europe, and both America and liberty prospered.

Through the bipartisan leadership of great Americans, including General George Marshall, Secretary of War Henry Stimson, and Presidents Harry Truman and Dwight Eisenhower, America rose—though somewhat reluctantly—to be liberty's standard-bearer. And even in those European nations that had fallen behind the Iron Curtain, such as Ukraine, the impulse for freedom hastened. For America, helping liberty defeat tyranny has always been bipartisan.

Recall the images of President John Kennedy in West Germany declaring "Ich bin ein Berliner."

President Ronald Reagan stood behind the Brandenburg Gate nearly two decades later near the Berlin Wall demanding, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall."

Those images defined the boundary between East and West: free people versus subjugated people.

It was barely 2 years after President Reagan's speech and after over four decades of free world vigilance that the world witnessed the profound victory of the valiant Solidarność workers in the steelyards of Gdansk, Poland.

Soon, captive nations subjugated by the Soviet Union for decades began to tumble. First, in 1989, Poland. Then in 1991, Ukraine. Then the entirety of the captive nations held subjugated by the Soviet Union. It was a major turning point in the arc of world history.

The Allied post-war institutions created to defend liberty still exist today. Indeed, now with Sweden and Finland

joining NATO, that alliance grows stronger than it has ever been.

Ukraine, too, seeks to join its European allies who are democratic in the European Union. Ukrainian soldiers meanwhile embattled and vastly outnumbered are dying, dying, dying for the cause of self-determination and liberty. Against great odds, Ukraine faces an enemy three times their population with far more military resources, but they fight.

To gain a sense of what Ukrainians are feeling right now, visit the World War II Memorial here in Washington, D.C. Seek to understand the sacrifices of the more than 400,000 Americans whose lives were given to liberty in its cause on the Atlantic, Pacific, and African fronts during the 20th century so that we, our generations, could remain free.

Under Soviet domination, no nation in the world suffered more than Ukraine. More than 4 million innocent people were systematically starved to death by Joseph Stalin, with millions upon millions upon millions more, whose names we will never know, murdered by Stalin's brutal Communist regime. America has been absent those horrors, thank God.

Despite these bestial atrocities, America at times has turned a blind eye to Russian atrocities dating back to its World War II unholy alliance with the Soviet Union to defeat Nazism.

In 2008, when Russian President Vladimir Putin stormed into The Republic of Georgia, President George W. Bush looked the other way. In 2014, when Vladimir Putin, entirely unprovoked, originally invaded Ukraine and subjugated Crimea, President Barack Obama paused.

Now Putin, in trying to capture the sovereign nation of Ukraine and hold it under his tyrannical claw, has gone too far. America has resumed its role as the vigorous and uncompromising defender of free and aspiring people. Liberty must check tyranny. Today, Ukraine seeks liberty for her 40 million people—Liberty must win. Liberty will win.

President Biden, Senate leaders CHUCK SCHUMER, MITCH MCCONNELL, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, Speaker Emerita NANCY PELOSI, and other impassioned advocates of both parties champion Ukraine's cause. America and our allies have responded to the crisis by sending fervent support in the form of weapons and humanitarian aid. What happens next? In one word, victory.

Our Nation does not exist alone on this globe. Isolation is strangulation. America's democratic ally Ukraine is pleading for help. President Biden has made his position clear: he will support Ukraine "as long as it takes." And he will not let Putin force Ukraine to negotiate away its territory. He takes these positions because he knows it would be aiding and abetting the enemy for America to look the other way. To do nothing is essentially choosing to side with Russia over Ukraine. In the long term that would be foolhardy and dangerous both for the United States and for a safer, more democratic world.

America is still a young land and, in some ways, largely sheltered from the lengths to

which vicious tyrants will go to wipe out free people. Putin is prepared to go to those lengths. This is the time to choose. This is the time to fight. This is the time to stand up and defend liberty, at home and abroad. Each generation must make fateful choices. So must we.

When our great Nation was founded, most of the world's population were slaves, serfs, or subjugated. Even then, one of our Founding Fathers, Patrick Henry, grasped the concept of liberty. He challenged our forbearers: "Give me Liberty or give me death." He understood what was at stake then, just as the people of Ukraine do today. So must we. The free world must choose liberty. America stands with our Allies to strengthen democracy, and realize in our time and generation a free, sovereign, and independent Ukraine. Slava Ukraini! Glory to Ukraine.

HONORING THE LATE JACOB CRUZ BARNES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Guam (Mr. MOYLAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOYLAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the late Jacob Cruz Barnes who sadly left this world earlier this month.

Jacob, also known as Jake, was a proud son of Guam and a proud veteran of the United States Air Force who served our great country for over 29 years in uniform. Jake also spent a good number of years ensuring that the many needs of our community were addressed in public service.

Unfortunately, the last couple of years were very challenging for Jake and his family as he was unable to get needed care that he required as he fought several medical challenges, including the fight for survival. The simple and decent services were unavailable in Guam for not only Jake, but for many other of our veterans.

These are individuals who have put so much on the line to preserve freedom and democracy to our great Nation and our beautiful island of Guam, that this country, this government needs to invest more to ensure when it is their time to obtain reliable care that it is made available for them at home where they can be with their family and loved ones.

Sadly, Jake had to relocate to the mainland to obtain additional care. We need to do more.

This government needs to take note that Guam has among the highest per capita enlistments in the Nation. We have proud patriots who call Guam their home. We have American citizens who are treated as second-class citizens when it comes to care, whether it be for our veterans or even when it comes to SSI for our disabled residents.

We can't say we are a land of opportunity when American citizens on U.S. territory are not provided equity.

Jake leaves behind a legacy of leadership, courage, and commitment to his family, our island, and our Nation.

I had the honor of serving with his wife, longtime senator and former

Speaker in the Guam legislature, Tina Muna Barnes, over the past 4 years. She, too, has always been a staunch advocate for equity when it comes to benefits for our community. I witnessed firsthand the challenges she and her family had to endure to ensure that care was made available for Jake. It wasn't easy.

From the Halls of this historic building which represent democracy and freedom, I honor a veteran, a son of Guam, the late Jacob Cruz Barnes.

On behalf of the 118th Congress, I express my deepest condolences to his wife, Speaker Tina, his four children, his grandchildren and great-grandchildren, and his many other family members.

Jake, thank you for your service and may you rest in peace.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 39 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

God, our guardian and sure defender, cause us not to go forth into this day with such haste that we fail to wait on You to direct our steps, for You have promised time and again that You will go before us. So we pray Your guidance for this day.

May we trust You to lead us where You would have us go. May we be sure that You have already prepared us to do the work that is set before us. May we anticipate the blessings You have provided for us. Remind us that we need only follow Your lead.

Then, O God, as You go before us, be also our rearguard. Surround us with Your encouragement when we are hesitant to move forward. Protect us from those who come from behind to exploit our vulnerabilities. Uphold us as we strain under the weight of schedules and expectations.

God, go before us to lead us, behind us to defend us, and be ever with us that we may enjoy the embrace of Your love.

In Your merciful name we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

BIDENFLATION BY THE NUMBERS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, since Biden has been in office, his irresponsible decisions, supported by the Democrat-led Congress, have left American families in financial stress.

Inflation, at a 40-year high, has increased the cost of everyday items. We have destruction of jobs. These policies have cost the typical household \$10,000. Additionally, year-to-year wage growth has been negative for 22 months.

Bidenflation is a tax on all Americans. At an inflation rate of 6.4 percent in January, we have an outrageous situation with rising prices. Eggs are up an astronomical 70 percent, butter up 33 percent, fuel oil up 28 percent, flour up 28 percent, lettuce up 17 percent, bread up 15 percent, and milk up 11 percent.

The newly elected House Republican majority, led by Speaker KEVIN MCCARTHY, is committed to fighting inflation, lowering the cost of living, and creating jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops who successfully protected America for 20 years as the global war on terrorism continues moving from the Afghanistan safe haven to America.

RECOGNIZING ADULT AND TEEN CHALLENGE

(Mr. ALFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Adult and Teen Challenge, or ATC, a faith-based organization serving on the front lines to combat our Nation's spiking drug and alcohol addiction crisis.

I am really proud that ATC, headquartered in the great State of

Missouri, is providing lifesaving services to thousands of people afflicted by substance abuse disorders.

Daily, more than a dozen people reach out to ATC looking for help for themselves or a loved one, and ATC is always answering the call.

ATC has provided recovery care through Christ-centered solutions for more than 14,000 persons per month in the last year.

It is really time that we recognize the importance of faith in the addiction recovery and support process for those working to see addiction numbers decrease instead of increase.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 347, REDUCE EXACERBATED INFLATION NEGATIVELY IMPACTING THE NATION ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 30, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RELATING TO "PRUDENCE AND LOYALTY IN SELECTING PLAN INVESTMENTS AND EXERCISING SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS"

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 166 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 166

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 347) to require the Executive Office of the President to provide an inflation estimate with respect to Executive orders with a significant effect on the annual gross budget, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage with-

out intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 30) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Resolution 166 provides for the consideration of two measures, H.R. 347 and H.J. Res. 30. The rule provides for H.R. 347, the REIN IN Act, to be considered under a structured rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability or their designees and provides for one motion to recommit. The rule makes in order 15 amendments.

Additionally, the rule provides for consideration of H.J. Res. 30, a resolution of congressional disapproval of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights" under a closed rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their designees and provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and in support of the underlying bills.

Today, the Republican majority is holding the Biden administration accountable. The American people sent the Republican majority to Washington to exercise a moderating influence on the executive branch and as a

check against President Biden and the Democrats' worst policy impulses.

Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 years, the American people have been at the mercy of President Biden's and the Democrats' reckless tax-and-spend agenda. Having survived those 2 long years, the American public could not stomach 2 more years of unified Democratic control in Washington, so this past November, American voters elected a Republican majority in the people's House to address the people's business.

Instead of devoting all of their time and effort to service industries and projects favored by Democratic consultants, the green lobby, and woke political activists, Republicans are working at breakneck pace to address the issues that the American people actually care about: protecting the retirement savings of hardworking Americans from Green New Deal radicals. The House GOP is the last line of defense between the American people and President Biden's inflationary agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I also commend Mr. BARR for introducing H.J. Res. 30 so we can bring this important piece of legislation to the floor today. Without his leadership on this issue, pensioners and retirees would be defenseless against the designs and machinations of a loud but vocal minority planning to conscript the retirement savings of retirees and American workers to pursue an investment agenda that is not founded on a fiduciary responsibility to maximize a return on investment.

Democrats understand that their Green New Deal agenda is politically toxic as far as the American public is concerned. They know that their radical energy agenda has been exposed and laid bare to the American people. For that reason, they have orchestrated and overseen a coordinated campaign to capture the boardrooms and the pension funds, seeking to implement the change that they simply could not achieve at the ballot box.

What Democrats are trying to achieve would be more intellectually and morally defensible if they had the courage to bring these measures to the floor for a vote in the people's House. In fact, the Democrats could not take that risk, Mr. Speaker. It would be a highly embarrassing spectacle exposing their woke, ESG agenda as toxic to the American public. Instead, Democrats and their radical environmental NGO allies will continue to work in the shadows, strong-arming and intimidating corporations and investors alike, using any means necessary to conscript the life savings of pensioners and retirees to implement a dangerous and illiberal investment strategy centered not on the welfare of retirees but on their favorite pet political projects.

In addition to this being an unwise and undemocratic investment strategy, Mr. Speaker, if this investment strategy is allowed to metastasize, the traditional energy sources that heat our homes, clean our drinking water, and

power our electrical grid will be seriously placed in jeopardy.

This isn't hypothetical, Mr. Speaker. Democratic policies are pushing our electrical grid to the brink. Reliable baseload generation sources are being phased out at a dizzying pace. The traditional energy projects that make the comforts of modern life possible are being prematurely marked for closure, not because they are uneconomical but because they run counter to the Democrats' crusade against fossil fuels.

□ 1215

In my native Texas, Mr. Speaker, I am in communication with capital market professionals who inform me that their firms will no longer invest in energy projects that provide dispatchable and reliable power to the electrical grid; not because these projects are underserving or won't deliver a return on investment, but for fear of being named by Democrats and their corporate allies for being insufficiently committed to their radical environmental agenda.

I am reminded of the passage from the Gospel of Matthew, Mr. Speaker: "You will know them by their fruits."

Democrats are once again looking to conscript the life savings of pensioners and retirees in this Green New Deal agenda.

Mr. Speaker, this is the deleterious downstream effect of the Democrats' Green New Deal and their moral panic. It is jeopardizing the health and well-being of American citizens in pursuit of a disturbing, dogmatic energy agenda that is myopically focused on potential environmental impacts rather than the flourishing and prosperity of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the conventional wisdom would suggest that President Biden and his Democrat allies in the House would step back and reassess their policies after having lost their majority in November.

One could be forgiven for thinking that having been humbled at the ballot box, Democrats would benefit from reflection and introspection to try to understand why American voters rejected their policies so thoroughly in the midterm elections.

Unfortunately for the American people, President Biden and House Democrats have doubled down on their inflationary and unpopular agenda all in the wake of November's election.

Instead of triangulating and trying to better align themselves with the priorities of everyday Americans, the Biden administration has continued this barrage of unpopular executive orders. From trying to cancel student loan debt to increasing household costs for American families through increased energy and food costs, Democrats and President Biden have demonstrated once again they are simply out of step with the American public.

This is why Republicans are united in holding the Biden administration accountable for their reckless economic

policies that seek to supercharge and further embed inflation into the American economy. The Republican majority is proud to bring to the floor H.R. 347, the REIN IN Act, which would mandate that the Biden administration undertake and produce a report for any major executive order that it issues that would detail the inflationary impact of said executive action.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate our Republican colleagues on finally releasing their big plan to end inflation. What a day.

We have all been home for 2 weeks. We know inflation is a big problem. We hear about it at the supermarket. We see it in our communities. It is a global problem impacting every single country.

Now over the last 2 years, Democrats here in the House, alongside President Biden, have taken aggressive action to fight inflation and lower prices, and at every step Republicans have voted "no," "no," "no."

At every step, they have boasted about their own alternative comprehensive plan to stop inflation in its tracks. It has got to be big. It has got to be really big; can't wait to read it. Wow, wait until you hear about the Republican plan to stop inflation in its tracks.

Forgive me if I am confused today, because after months of waiting with bated breath, after all your announcements and after all your press releases and all your tweets about inflation, we finally find out what your big plan to stop inflation really is, your big bill to address the American people's number one concern.

It is a report. More government paperwork. Great.

I mean, will people be able to print out the report and trade it in for cheaper gas or lower food prices? Because unless they can, and I am not an economist here, but I don't think this is going to make a difference.

The bill, and I hesitate to call it a bill, because it might as well be a tweet or a press release, does nothing. Maybe it should be an amendment to an actual bill that fights inflation—just a suggestion. Don't try to pass this off as a real plan. Don't pretend this actually does anything.

I am embarrassed. I am embarrassed for my Republican colleagues, to be honest.

Mr. Speaker, it took 2 years to put this together?

The number one issue for the American people and this is what they come up with?

A book report on inflation.

It reminds me of the time last year when they tried to solve crime with a report. This is what happens when you

try to write a bill for Twitter instead of a bill that actually helps everyday people.

The audacity, the sheer audacity of saying all this inflation was caused by President Biden when the guy before him added nearly \$8 trillion to the national debt, when the guy before him presided over a 39 percent increase in the national debt, when the guy before him accumulated 25 percent of the total debt in American history. The hypocrisy is incredible.

Now, just contrast that with what Democrats did to rein in inflation and lower costs for people.

Democrats capped insulin at \$35 per month.

Democrats reduced the price of prescription drugs for seniors.

Democrats, for the first time in history, are making sure that Big Pharma faces penalties for raising their prices faster than inflation.

Democrats are saving families money with special tax credits for making good investments—all things that Republicans voted against.

Mr. Speaker, 100 percent of Republicans voted against reducing drug prices; 100 percent of them voted against cheaper insulin for our senior citizens; 100 percent of them voted against lower gas prices.

I guess we could give them some credit because only 95 percent of them voted against lower food prices.

Hear me out here. Maybe Republicans don't want to solve inflation. Maybe they know that addressing inflation takes on greedy CEOs, Big Oil, and billionaire corporations. Maybe they know it means standing up to Putin, who is driving up energy prices with his war in Ukraine.

Maybe Republicans are too scared to fight inflation, but Democrats are ready to go to bat against corporate greed, because we stand with everyday families who are being hurt by rising costs.

Today, Leader JEFFRIES is introducing the PRO Act, a bill empowering workers to unionize and hold their employers accountable for improper work practices. Because while Republicans continue standing with the billionaire corporations responsible for price gouging, Democrats stand with workers hurt by inflation. We support their right to organize for better wages.

Instead of wasting time writing a bill that only requires a book report on inflation, we spent the last 2 years taking action to actually stop inflation in the long term by bringing jobs and manufacturing back to America.

Democrats secured over \$300 billion in investments in U.S. manufacturing to move supply chains back to America.

We voted to lower food and fuel prices, made the most robust updates in 70 years to the Buy American Act to boost domestic manufacturing, and after the Ocean Shipping Reform Act to cut costs for American families and bring down shipping prices, oversaw

the largest 1-year decrease in the Federal deficit in American history. That is the Democratic record.

Now, we don't claim its perfect. Prices are still too high. Inflation is hurting people. I know it. Joe Biden knows it. Democratic leadership knows it. So there is a difference here. There is a difference here, and it is a big one.

Democrats are fighting for the families being hurt by inflation and taking on the greedy corporations who are driving prices up. And Republicans, their solution is to blame Democrats, blame Biden, and write a book report.

Now, I guess when you have no plans, when you have no real ideas, you will do anything to say you did something. That is all this is: a talking point, a press release, and a total waste of time. Apparently, the bar is on the ground for this new House majority, and it is a real shame.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution that affirms the House's unwavering commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare and states that it is the position of the House to reject any cuts to the programs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD along with any extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Social Security and Medicare are the bedrock of our Nation's social safety net. Yet, as many of my Republican colleagues demand reckless cuts in exchange for paying our Nation's bills, these programs are under threat.

Despite recent rhetoric to the contrary, Republicans claim that they won't cut Social Security and Medicare benefits.

Well, Mr. Speaker, today, Democrats are giving Republicans a chance to back up that claim with action by providing them a chance to reassure the American people not just with their words, but with their votes.

Today, they can vote unequivocally that they won't cut these vital programs. Anything short of that is an empty promise.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that none of my fellow Republican colleagues want to come down and join in with my colleague from Texas to talk about how great this bill is to fight inflation. I would be embar-

rassed to be here defending this measure, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from The Washington Post titled, "What should the White House do to combat inflation? Experts weighed in with 12 ideas."

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 26, 2022]
WHAT SHOULD THE WHITE HOUSE DO TO COMBAT INFLATION? EXPERTS WEIGHED IN WITH 12 IDEAS

(By Jeff Stein and Rachel Siegel)

The United States is experiencing its most dramatic burst of inflation in four decades, as rising prices hit nearly every sector of the economy and create new political hurdles for the Biden administration.

As the country frets over inflation and the administration weighs how to react, The Washington Post asked independent experts from across the ideological spectrum how they would respond if they controlled the White House.

Their 12 ideas include using antitrust to break up large corporations, relaxing the trade war with China, and massively scaling up U.S. manufacturing production, among other proposals. Some of the experts blamed President Biden for increasing economic demand, while others insisted that concerns about inflation have been overblown. The proposals are not meant as exhaustive, and many of these economists support each other's ideas.

1: MAKE AMERICA PRODUCE AGAIN

We can once again make the United States the world's workshop for democracy

(By Robert C. Hockett)

It should have been obvious even in February 2020 that the coronavirus was going to present the American economy with both demand-side and supply-side challenges. It should therefore also have been obvious that measures to boost demand with government programs—such as stimulus checks and unemployment benefits—would fuel inflationary pressures if not accompanied by measures to boost supply and the availability of goods and products.

Almost two years after our pandemic began, policymakers are now finally talking about supply chains, as they should have done early in 2020. But thus far they are talking almost solely about improving the domestic transport links in those chains—not the production of what is being consumed.

Attention to truck routes, warehouses and loading docks is helpful, but it isn't nearly enough in our present environment—not in a world where we needlessly import so much of what we used to produce.

This presents all of us with a grand opportunity now—to reverse inflation in a manner that restores American production and world leadership in the industries of today and tomorrow. We can, in other words, make our war on inflation a war on national decline.

For instance, America invented the semiconductor industry and then globally dominated it for decades until the turn of the millennium. Yet since we relinquished our lead over microchips to insecure sources such as China and Taiwan, the importance of this ubiquitous input to all modern products has only grown. That is why so many supply shortage stories we read about now—from autos to homes to appliances—boil down to chip shortage stories.

Next, consider electric vehicles and their lithium-ion batteries, as well as other related forms of high-capacity power storage, such as the big battery packs used by power generation stations nationwide. Here, too, production lines are bottlenecked, slowing

product availability, lengthening product waitlists and raising product prices.

Similar stories to these can be told about solar power cells; hydrogen fuel cells; steel, concrete and other housing materials; essential medical equipment; affordable cutting-edge pharmaceuticals; rare-earth metals; and a host of other essential inputs to modern life. If we want to end inflation and reclaim the mantle of “workshop of the free world” in one stroke, there can be no better way forward than to invest massively in restoring U.S. productive prowess.

It can be done. When Nazi Germany rolled over France in but six weeks in 1940, President Franklin D. Roosevelt demanded that our aircraft industry, which had produced just over 3,000 planes the previous year, produce at least 50,000 planes that year. Roosevelt then directly set about building the factories, in consultation with public officials and private-sector industries, to produce U.S. planes, ships, tanks, trucks, munitions, synthetic rubber and other materiel. The government then cheaply leased these facilities to manufacturers with plausible production plans, selling them once the war had been won.

Roosevelt also built entire neighborhoods for workers wishing to move near the new factories, schools for their children, clinics for their health and power lines for their domestic needs, making the United States the world’s “arsenal of democracy.”

This massive expansion provided the productive foundation for America’s global economic leadership from the end of the war to the late 1970s. We lost that edge only when we began massively “outsourcing” in the 1980s and 1990s.

We have all the tools Roosevelt had. The president and White House Cabinet, in consultation with experts from industry, should plan a national reindustrialization across industries in every region of the country, and the Federal Financing Bank within Treasury can fund projects devised by all relevant federal agencies.

We can once again make the United States the world’s workshop for democracy. That will reverse not only inflation, but also four decades of decline.

—Robert C. Hockett is a law professor at Cornell Law School.

2: STOP THE SPENDING

This surge in spending is a key driver of other prices

(By Brian Riedl)

A year ago, the Federal Reserve forecast that inflation would increase by 1.8 percent in 2021. Instead, consumer prices jumped 7 percent—the highest rate since 1982. Some of this unanticipated inflation was driven by knotty issues such as supply chain disruptions, rising energy prices, and shifts in demand to sectors with less capacity to maintain low prices.

Yet Washington poured gasoline on this fire by enacting the \$1.9 trillion American Rescue Plan in March. This surge in spending is a key driver of higher prices faced by consumers. To combat it, lawmakers should begin paring back portions of the remaining \$500 billion in scheduled spending from the rescue plan, put Biden’s Build Back Better legislation on the back burner and resist new spending sprees.

The critics of Biden’s rescue plan were ignored, mocked—and ultimately vindicated. A year ago, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that the baseline economy would operate \$420 billion below capacity in 2021, and then gradually close that output gap by 2025. Biden and congressional Democrats—believing that the Great Recession had been unnecessarily lengthened by insufficient stimulus—overlearned their lesson and de-

cided to shoot a \$1.9 trillion bazooka at a \$420 billion output gap.

The problem is that once America’s output capacity taps out, any additional stimulus will simply bring inflation rather than additional production—especially when financed in part by Federal Reserve bond purchases. Economists on the left and right warned lawmakers that ARP would accelerate inflation, with top Clinton and Obama White House economist Lawrence Summers leading the charge.

With the word “trillion” becoming commonplace, it is easy to downplay the sheer size of the American Rescue Plan. It is the most expensive spending law of the past 50 years, including the Cares Act approved under President Donald Trump.

In its first seven months, ARP spent \$1.2 trillion—which exceeds the entire cost of the 2017 tax cuts from their enactment through the same late 2021 date. All this spending is on top of the December 2020 stimulus bill that poured in \$900 billion.

The inflation damage created by Biden’s stimulus would be more justifiable if it was necessary to end the pandemic. However, just 1 percent of its cost went toward vaccines and 5 percent had any direct relation to health care. Instead, the law gave state and local governments \$350 billion for budget deficits that did not exist. Schools received \$129 billion even as they sat on \$50 billion in unused relief funds from earlier emergency bills. The unemployment bonuses were so large and self-defeating that 26 states took the rare step of refusing federal assistance and canceling the bonuses before they expired. Even the popular relief checks—which, combined with earlier checks, amounted to \$11,400 for a typical family of four—contributed to the very inflation that ultimately eroded their value.

Moving forward, combating inflation requires addressing supply chains, reducing tariffs and gradually tightening Federal Reserve policy. Yet it makes no sense to push one foot on the gas and one foot on the brake. Lawmakers should explore options to pare back the \$500 billion in scheduled ARP spending, such as rescinding extraneous assistance to K–12 education, businesses and private pension bailouts. They should also reject BBB legislation that would spend trillions more upfront, yet delays many of its disinflationary taxes until later years. BBB’s subsidies and regulations would also drive drastic price increases in child care, and thus should be rejected.

—Brian Riedl is a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute.

3: CONTROL THE COVID PANDEMIC

‘Covid’s fingerprints on inflation are unmistakable’

(By Claudia Sahm)

Consumer prices rose 7 percent in 2021—the fastest pace in 40 years—and covid deaths doubled to more than 800,000. These two facts are bound together. The solution to today’s high inflation, as with labor shortages and supply chain disruptions, is clear: Contain the pandemic.

Federal Reserve Chair Jerome H. Powell agrees. Asked at his reconfirmation hearing by Sen. Catherine Cortez Masto (D-Nev.) if he believes containing the pandemic is the best way to fight inflation, Powell said: “I do. And imagine a world in which we no longer have to deal with the pandemic. . . . We would quickly see the supply-side problems alleviate. We’d probably see significantly more labor supply. So these issues are still related to the pandemic.”

The data supports Powell and experts like me who focus on covid. As one example, economists at the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco estimate that the price in-

creases in the spending categories most sensitive to covid disruptions accounted for about half of the total inflation (excluding food and energy) before the pandemic. Now they account for three-quarters of it. Of course, what’s pandemic-related and what’s not is impossible to know for certain. But covid’s fingerprints on inflation are unmistakable.

We do not have a monetary policy crisis. We have a covid crisis. In fact, up to this point, fiscal and monetary policy have been a relatively bright spot in the pandemic and notably better than after the Great Recession. Yes, inflation is high. Consumer spending, even with the higher prices, is strong. The unemployment rate dropped below 4 percent in December, less than two years after the recession began. Overall, the economy is moving rapidly in the right direction. But the pandemic is moving rapidly in the wrong direction with the omicron variant.

To fight inflation, the Biden White House must end the pandemic. The goals the administration set in January 2021, including “expanding masking, testing, treatment, data, workforce and clear public health standards” and “protect[ing] those most at risk,” are the right ones. Julia Raifman, a public health professor at Boston University, argues: “That’s what we need to do now that will help us navigate our way out of this pandemic. If we don’t have that, we will continue to have the virus manage us.” High inflation and labor shortages will continue too.

The White House must use all its influence to push business leaders, community organizers, members of Congress, governors and mayors across the political spectrum to join in these public health efforts. Instead, administration officials used their bully pulpit to bust a strike by the Chicago teachers union over a lack of coronavirus protections, saying that they “do not believe people should be sitting at home” and should go to unsafe workplaces. That won’t solve our economic problems, but it will kill people.

The Fed is not “behind the curve” in fighting inflation. It’s the White House that’s behind on “bending the curve” of covid cases, and it’s falling further behind every day.

—Claudia Sahm is the director of macroeconomic research at the Jain Family Institute.

4: INVEST IN CHILD CARE

Child-care policies ‘can boost the capacity, productivity and the potential of our economy’

(By Lauren Melodia)

Although the unemployment rate is falling faster than expected, the pandemic continues to fundamentally disrupt our economy. Many people are choosing to remain out of the labor market altogether until public health conditions and disruptions subside, which in turn limits productive capacity and can raise prices. One policy that could address many of these issues across sectors at once has already passed the House and is waiting for Senate action: public investment in our child-care system.

Child care is the backbone of our economy and can enable all parents—who historically have some of the highest labor force participation rates across all genders, races and education levels—to get and keep a job. But as of 2018, many communities across the country are child-care deserts—a result of our nation’s complex history of underfunding, undervaluing and under-compensating care work and women’s labor more broadly.

The covid pandemic has further decimated this infrastructure. As of this time last year, 20,000 child-care providers were estimated to have permanently shut down. And yet ample evidence exists that access to even part-time day care and preschool programming has a

dramatic impact on parents' labor force participation.

Private markets and existing policies will not solve these problems on their own, for many reasons.

First, America's historical and continued reliance on unpaid care workers drives women's wages down throughout the economy. This is one of the major dynamics of the gender pay gap and makes the choice of paying for child care unaffordable for many families. Because care work traditionally done by women is unpaid, women are undervalued in the labor market—where they make 83 cents on the dollar to men. That disincentivizes them from entering the labor market. What results is a cycle in which women are unable to secure jobs that allow them to pay for the cost of child care, which in turn keeps the pay for child-care providers low.

Second, because of this dynamic, the child-care industry is built around low wages and thin, unsustainable profits that have contributed to the failure of the market to deliver a greater supply of child-care centers to meet demand.

Lastly, the government's existing consumer subsidies program, while making child care more affordable for many, has not resulted in the growth of the supply of child care. A 2021 Government Accountability Office report found that 78 percent of families eligible for child-care subsidies do not use them, often because there are no available spaces at local child-care facilities or because they live in a child-care desert.

By making supply-side child-care investments—building new child-care centers; offering loans and grants to existing or recently closed small-business child-care providers; and offering universal pre-K—we could both enable parents to reenter the workforce and create new jobs in child care. Those new jobs would disproportionately go to Black and Brown women, who have been hit hardest by the pandemic and are still suffering from some of the lowest employment rates. Black women, who historically have some of the highest labor force participation rates in the country, currently experience the largest gap (3.5 percent) in their employment rate, comparing December 2021 with pre-pandemic levels.

Many of these policies were passed by the House in the Build Back Better Act and are now on the table in the Senate. And once they are passed and implemented, we can boost the capacity, productivity and the potential of our economy and reduce future economic disruptions—all of which can be deflationary and stabilizing.

Insofar as today's inflation—or the fear of future inflation—is linked to labor market tightness or dynamics, investment in child care is critical for minimizing ongoing disruptions and expanding people's ability to work across all industries in our economy.

—Lauren Melodia is the deputy director of macroeconomic analysis at the Roosevelt Institute.

5: TAX WEALTHY INVESTORS

The richest 10 percent consume as much as the bottom 40 percent combined

(By William Spriggs)

The economy proved far less resilient to the shock of the global coronavirus crisis than most people had expected. We need to focus on measures that increase the supply of goods and target price inflation—particularly in markets where inequality is helping drive prices—rather than taking measures that would destroy jobs and weaken growth. One way to do so would be to raise capital gains taxes on investors and levy new taxes on income from stock dividends.

Consumption in America is currently extraordinarily “top-heavy,” meaning the

wealthy consume far more than most people. In fact, the richest 10 percent consume as much as the bottom 40 percent combined, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Instead of taking measures that would hurt growth and cost jobs, policymakers could temper demand amid massive supply chain disruptions by slowing down the consumption of those at the very top with modest taxes on the rich.

A tax on short-term capital gains and dividends would disproportionately target wealthy Americans who are currently responsible for very high demand. This would alleviate the pressures on the supply chain without leading to a broader economic slowdown. Encouraging longer-term savings—and having companies retain earnings—will keep balance sheets strong and result in investments that can help the economy become more resilient.

It's worth stressing the potential danger of alternative approaches. Using the blunt instrument of raising interest rates, the tool of the Federal Reserve, would be an attempt at price controls. But that mechanism for lowering prices would broadly shrink demand across the income distribution. Lower demand would lower prices, at the cost of even lower production. In the case of automobiles, for instance, that would be disastrous, because the unprecedented spike in used-car prices is caused by the collapse in the current auto supply; domestic production in November was at 58 percent of its February 2020 level. We do not want to solve inflation by starving the economy and causing production to plummet.

Policymakers should remember that inflationary trends are caused in part by numerous factors outside higher demand, and we need to be careful if we are attempting to tame it. We have seen a rapid recovery in demand for consumer goods, but weak demand for services. This switch in consumption has helped protect employment by facilitating the movement of workers forced out of the service sector, but it comes with higher prices for some goods. In addition to exacting a devastating human toll, the lack of protections for workers has led to millions getting sick, creating disruptions that lead to supply shocks that drive up prices. And it's not clear exactly how broad-based inflation is. For instance, rental costs have been relatively stable—well within the Federal Reserve's target level for inflation—in another sign that price pressures have more to do with supply shocks and demand shifts than an overheating economy.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, maybe my friends on the other side of the aisle should take a look at this article. While I don't agree with all the ideas in here, at least this article has actual ideas to bring down inflation, instead of the Republican plan to write a book report on inflation to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that the American people deserve better. They deserve more than a book report. They deserve action that will make a positive difference in their lives.

I encourage my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule and vote “no” on the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from The Hill titled, “Five actions Biden has taken in response to high gas prices.”

[From The Hill, Apr. 22, 2022]

FIVE ACTIONS BIDEN HAS TAKEN IN RESPONSE TO HIGH GAS PRICES

(By ZACK BUDRYK)

Gas prices are both a top concern for American consumers and a consistent drag

on President Biden's approval rating, prompting the administration to take several measures to counter pain at the pump.

An ABC News/Ipsos poll in March indicated widespread approval for the president's decision to ban oil imports from Russia over its invasion of Ukraine, which Biden has warned could exacerbate energy costs. However, the same poll indicated 70 percent of respondents disapprove of Biden's handling of gas prices.

A number of factors impact gas prices, and experts note many of them are outside the White House's control. Still, the administration has taken several steps in hopes of providing some temporary or near-term relief.

Here are five actions the Biden administration has taken so far on gas prices:

1. RELEASING OIL FROM THE STRATEGIST RESERVE

Biden initially announced a release of 50 million barrels of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve in November in response to rising gas prices.

However, after a further spike around the time of Russia's invasion of Ukraine earlier this year, Biden announced another one-time release of 30 million barrels followed by an average daily release of 1 million barrels over the next six months—or about 180 million barrels overall.

Biden told reporters in late March that the price of gas “could come down fairly significantly” as a result of the move.

In the days after, gas prices fell about eight cents, according to AAA, although they have since crept up. However, during the same period, some regions of China imposed lockdowns in response to new COVID-19 outbreaks, which reduced overall demand.

“This is a wartime bridge to increase oil supply until production ramps up later this year. And it is by far the largest release from our national reserve in our history,” Biden said as he announced the release. “It will provide a historic amount of supply for a historic amount of time—a six-month bridge to the fall.”

2. REMOVING RESTRICTIONS ON SALE OF HIGHER-ETHANOL FUEL

In an executive order last week, Biden removed restrictions on the sale of E15, or fuel that is 15 percent ethanol, between June and September of this year.

Ethanol-heavy fuel is sold at a limited number of stations concentrated in corn-producing states, and sales are normally restricted during the summer months due to concerns that another mix, E10, could contribute to increased air pollution. Ethanol and renewable fuel industries, however, maintain that tailpipe emissions, rather than fuel volatility, is a bigger contributor to smog, and that E15 is less of a contributor than E10.

Biden administration officials projected at the time that the availability of E15 could save a family about 10 cents per gallon on average.

“This will also help us bridge towards real energy independence and implementing the emergency fuel waiver the [Environmental Protection Agency] EPA will work with states across the country to ensure there are no significant air quality impacts in the summer driving season,” an official said on a call with reporters. “EPA is also considering additional action to facilitate the use of E15 year-round, including continued discussions with states who have expressed interest in allowing year-round use of E15.”

3. ASKING OIL-PRODUCING NATIONS TO INCREASE PRODUCTION

The U.S. has appealed to members of OPEC to step up production and exports to cover demand, including Saudi Arabia in particular.

However, this plan has encountered difficulties due to the rocky Washington-Riyadh relationship.

The Biden administration has faced tensions with the Saudis due to America's vocal criticism of the Gulf kingdom's human rights record, particularly the Yemen civil war and the 2018 killing of dissident journalist Jamal Khashoggi.

Meanwhile, human rights advocates have called it inconsistent to seek closer ties with Saudi Arabia while seeking to isolate Russia over its invasion of Ukraine.

"I hate that the Biden administration has to figure out how to leverage our relationship with Saudi Arabia to get them to do that so that my constituents aren't being squeezed at the pump," Rep. Tom Malinowski (D-N.J.) told reporters in March.

Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman, who numerous intelligence agencies have concluded ordered Khashoggi's killing, reportedly refused a call from Biden soon after the Russian invasion. White House press secretary Jen Psaki has denied the report.

4. PRESSURING U.S. OIL COMPANIES

Republicans have vocally blamed the Biden administration's energy policies, in particular an executive order freezing new oil and gas leasing on public lands, for gas prices and insufficient supply.

That pause has been in limbo since a court order halting it last summer, and the Biden administration last Friday officially announced a forthcoming lease sale.

In the meantime, however, the administration has sought to shift the blame to oil companies and accused them of gouging customers, pointing to the industry's numerous currently unused leases, which include some 9,000 approved drilling permits.

Biden has called for Congress to enact a "use it or lose it" policy that would impose fees on companies that do not make use of their leased land.

"I have no problem with corporations turning a good profit. But companies have an obligation that goes beyond just their shareholders to their customers, their communities and their country," Biden told reporters in late March. "No American company should take advantage of a pandemic or [Russian President] Vladimir Putin's actions to enrich themselves at the expense of American families."

5. PROMOTING THE TRANSITION TO RENEWABLE ENERGY

Amid concrete steps to bring down consumer prices, the Biden administration has emphasized the necessity for increased support and infrastructure for renewable fuels, saying the current market illustrates the need for less volatile resources.

In a fact sheet distributed to reporters, the administration presented its steps to increase access to clean energy as a key tenet of its response to gas prices.

Specifically, officials pointed to sales of offshore wind leases, with a goal of 30 gigawatts of offshore wind installed by the end of the decade. Officials further cited the Interior Department's road map this week that sets a target of doubling clean energy permits, with a goal of 25 gigawatts installed by 2025.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, President Biden has taken steps to lower prices at the pump for the American people. Since prices began to rise, President Biden released 50 million barrels of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, removed restrictions on the sale of higher ethanol fuel, and called out oil companies for taking advantage of their customers, commu-

nities, and their country. He also continues to promote a transition to renewable energy.

So President Biden has acted to try to lower prices. My Republican colleagues cannot do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I will say finally that we have some serious challenges in this country. Inflation is one of them. The idea that after all the buildup, after all the talk of, We have a comprehensive plan to fight inflation. This is it? This is it?

This is an embarrassment, Mr. Speaker. There are things that we can do together to lower costs for the American people. A book report doesn't lower the cost for anybody.

□ 1230

By the way, under this bill, the book report that is required for executive orders, it is not even required to be published. They could write a book report, and no one gets to see it.

I mean, this is not what the American people had hoped for. They had hoped we would come together and kind of rally around ideas that would actually make a difference in their lives.

So, yeah. You can pass this and say, we just passed this big plan to fight inflation and then hope that nobody realizes that you did nothing.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, this is a missed opportunity. This was a time, quite frankly, where committees of jurisdiction should have come together, done hearings, heard ideas, Republican ideas and Democratic ideas, and taken the best of them and brought them to the floor; ideas that would have made a difference in people's lives. This does nothing. This does nothing.

So I guess you can tweet out that you voted for a book report on inflation and hope that your constituents will think that somehow you accomplished something big, but I would say that my constituents certainly would not be satisfied with this.

Mr. Speaker, all this talk about bringing down the deficit—and do I need to remind everybody that the first Republican bill passed this year when we came into the majority, their first bill added \$114 billion to the national debt. I mean, come on.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from The Hill titled, "CBO: GOP's IRS bill will add \$114 billion to deficit."

[From The Hill, Jan. 9, 2023]

CBO: GOP'S IRS BILL WILL ADD \$114B TO DEFICIT

(By Mike Lillis and Aris Folley)

The Republican proposal to eliminate billions of dollars in IRS funding will pile more than \$100 billion onto federal deficits, according to a new estimate from Congress's official budget scorekeeper.

The bill, which is slated to hit the House floor Monday night as the first legislative act of the new GOP majority, would claw back most of the almost \$80 billion in new IRS funding provided under the Democrats' massive climate, health and tax package, which was signed by President Biden last year.

Almost \$46 billion of that spending would go toward agency enforcement efforts designed to prevent certain taxpayers—largely corporations and wealthy individuals—from paying less than they owe.

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimated Monday that the legislation would cut federal spending by \$71 billion, but would reduce tax revenue to the tune of almost \$186 billion. The net effect would be a \$114 billion increase in deficits over the next decade.

The numbers were not overlooked by Democrats, who wasted no time hammering Republicans for vowing to rein in deficit spending, then defying that promise in their first act of business.

"It's a giant tax cut for rich tax cheats," White House chief of staff Ron Klain tweeted on Monday. "Bill #1 from the new House GOP. Adds to the deficit."

Republicans had made the IRS funding cut a top promise on the midterm campaign trail, warning that the money would lead to the hiring of 87,000 new tax collectors to target middle-income Americans. Some Republicans said those agents would be armed.

Those claims were highly misleading, however, as much of the funding will go to hire thousands of customer service agents and other employees with no auditing responsibilities. And the 87,000 figure is a reference to the total number of employees—not just auditors—the IRS hopes to hire over the next decade, when 52,000 workers are expected to retire.

Additionally, Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen has said that, while the new funding is crucial to streamline processing and eliminate the backlog of returns, the agency will not increase audit rates for those taxpayers making less than \$400,000.

Still, few government agencies are less popular than the IRS, and the Republican message appeared to resonate with the GOP base.

"On our very first bill, we're going to repeal 87,000 IRS agents," Rep. Kevin McCarthy (R-Calif.), who was newly elected as Speaker, said last year as he unveiled the Republicans' agenda. "Our job is to work for you, not go after you."

Zach Moller, who previously worked as a Senate Democratic budget aide, says the GOP's bill would violate previous House rules targeting legislation that would add to the deficit, known as PAYGO, that were in effect when Democrats held control.

Under the prior rules, Moller explained, it wouldn't be in order for lawmakers to "have a bill on the floor that increases the deficit over the first five or seven or first 10 years." The PAYGO rules were often waived, but aimed at fiscal responsibility, Moller said.

The Republican majority is expected on Monday to pass a new set of rules governing the new Congress, to include a so-called "CUTGO" rule that exempts tax cuts from the deficit spending prohibitions.

Mr. MCGOVERN. So anyway, look, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, and again, I want to repeat that.

The reason why you want to vote "no" is because the previous question basically would allow us to bring up an amendment that basically says it is not the intention of this House to do anything to cut Social Security or Medicare.

My friends, they are all upset, notwithstanding their rhetoric, that they want to go after Social Security and Medicare.

Yeah, they were all upset that they were being called out on their words. Well, here is an opportunity to put

that to rest; very, very simple. We are not going to cut Social Security. We are not going to cut Medicare.

So if you vote "no" on the previous question, we can do that. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule, "no" on the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

You know, driving to the airport early Monday morning on the way back up here for another week in Washington, the price of gas was \$3 a gallon in Texas in February.

Now, that is bad news because by the time you get to Memorial Day, the peak of the summer driving season, gasoline is always a dollar more than it is in February.

So, look. The President was able to bring the price of gas down artificially by depleting our emergency reserve, and who does that? Who does that?

Who spends all of their emergency funds and says, "Good on me. I brought the prices down," when you didn't do anything to increase the supply?

Now, here is the good news. One of the reasons we aren't surrounded by a lot of our colleagues right now on the floor of the House debating this rule is because Members, both Democrats and Republicans, are in committees, in the committees of jurisdiction, doing the actual work.

I left a markup from the Energy and Commerce Committee, the Subcommittee on Energy, looking at ways to increase our supply of energy to do what? To bring down the cost of energy for consumers.

That seems like a logical thing to do. We see what the administration's response was. It was to sign an executive order to say, we are going to cut off a pipeline so you can't bring any more product into the United States.

You can't ship that product from Canada down to Port Arthur, Texas, and refine it with Texas jobs. No. They cut that off. As a consequence, it has to be made up somewhere else.

The good news is we didn't run out, and there is additional supply. There is additional energy to be pumped, harvested certainly in the Permian Basin and the Delaware Basin of Texas.

The good news is that producers, a lot of small and independent producers, are doing just that.

So rather than having to go hat in hand to OPEC or OPEC+—I guess, now because they added Russia to OPEC—rather than having to go to a dictator in Venezuela, you can buy your oil and gas from the United States of America.

Who is doing that? Well, Germany is doing that. They hastened the development of several LNG offshoring plants so that they could bring in that Texas product to heat the homes of Germans who have been cut off by Vladimir Putin in an attempt to starve Europe for energy during the Ukraine war.

You know, one of these bills that we are debating, the rule that we are de-

bating will allow a bill to come to the floor for debate on looking into the cost of executive orders.

I already referenced one of those executive orders; one done on the very first day of the Biden administration, which was to negate the Keystone pipeline, but there were others.

The Committee for Responsible Budget actually has calculated a total of \$1.1 trillion in executive orders in the last 2 years and 2 months since this President has taken office.

Digging into the numbers—and, of course, it will be a big story over at the Supreme Court later this week—but the President wants to cancel student loan debt; that is \$750 billion.

Shouldn't that be a consequence that is argued in Congress? It is not done just through an executive order.

Look, we wisely rejected a monarchy, and we said we want government with the consent of the governed. That means that all of the decisions do not flow from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

By virtue of the fact that we have a divided government, the people's House is supposed to weigh in on these decisions.

They are not made unilaterally by the President of the United States, which, by definition, is what an executive order is.

So we have \$185 billion in increased staff benefits. Maybe good; maybe not. The gentleman from Massachusetts and I agree on programs that tackle hunger in this country, but shouldn't we as Members of the people's House have the opportunity to debate that rather than the decision simply made by one individual down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue?

We already talked about the Keystone pipeline. Canceling ANWR. Canceling ANWR, the exploration and development of oil in that plain in Alaska, which has been—honest Injun.

If Clinton had not prevented that, if President Clinton had not prevented that in 1997, that would be a producing field today that would reduce our trade deficit, to be sure.

So we would be able to produce American energy but also would have had a profound effect on the budget because, in fact, Mr. Speaker, you will recall it was a budget bill that year where President Clinton then blocked the development in the ANWR.

What about repealing President Trump's rules on the waters of the United States and the NEPA streamlining rules?

All of these things have been done as executive orders since this President took office, and the consequence, the fiscal consequence, the downstream consequence has been profound.

So, look. I want to encourage everyone in the House today to support these measures when they come to the floor.

If you want to remake financial markets, you can't do that by congressional fiat. You have to have the courage to bring that measure to the floor for a vote.

I would encourage Members additionally to support the REIN IN Act, and this measure will act as an important check on the Biden administration, forcing President Biden to grapple with the harm that his executive orders are inflicting on the long-suffering American people.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans remain united in pursuing legislative policies that put the American people at the forefront, put them ahead of the special interests, put them ahead of the army of lawyers and lobbyists that occupy this town. Let's put the people of America first.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 166

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 178) affirming the House of Representatives' commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. Res. 178.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 166; and

Adoption of House Resolution 166, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 347, REDUCE EXACERBATED INFLATION NEGATIVELY IMPACTING THE NATION ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 30, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RELATING TO "PRUDENCE AND LOYALTY IN SELECTING PLAN INVESTMENTS AND EXERCISING SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 166) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 347) to require the Executive Office of the President to provide an inflation estimate with respect to Executive orders with a significant effect on the annual gross budget, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 30) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights", on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 201, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]
YEAS—213

Aderholt	Bucshon	DesJarlais
Alford	Burchett	Diaz-Balart
Allen	Burgess	Donalds
Amodei	Burlison	Duarte
Armstrong	Calvert	Duncan
Arrington	Cammack	Dunn (FL)
Babin	Carey	Edwards
Bacon	Carl	Ellzey
Baird	Carter (GA)	Emmer
Balderson	Carter (TX)	Estes
Banks	Chavez-DeRemer	Ezell
Barr	Ciscomani	Fallon
Bean (FL)	Cline	Feenstra
Bentz	Cloud	Ferguson
Bergman	Clyde	Finstad
Bice	Cole	Fischbach
Biggs	Collins	Fitzgerald
Bilirakis	Comer	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (NC)	Crawford	Fleischmann
Boebert	Crenshaw	Flood
Bost	Curtis	Foxx
Brecheen	D'Esposito	Franklin, C.
Buchanan	Davidson	Scott
Buck	De La Cruz	Fry

Fulcher	Langworthy	Rose
Gaetz	Latta	Rosendale
Gallagher	LaTurner	Rouzer
Garbarino	Lawler	Roy
Garcia, Mike	Lee (FL)	Rutherford
Gimenez	Lesko	Salazar
Gonzales, Tony	Loudermilk	Santos
Good (VA)	Lucas	Scalise
Gooden (TX)	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert
Gosar	Luna	Scott, Austin
Granger	Mace	Self
Graves (LA)	Malliotakis	Sessions
Graves (MO)	Mann	Simpson
Green (TN)	Massie	Smith (MO)
Greene (GA)	Mast	Smith (NE)
Griffith	McCaul	Smith (NJ)
Grothman	McClain	Smucker
Guest	McClintock	Spartz
Guthrie	McCormick	Stauber
Hageman	McHenry	Steel
Harris	Meuser	Stefanik
Harshbarger	Miller (IL)	Steil
Hern	Miller (OH)	Stewart
Higgins (LA)	Miller (WV)	Strong
Hill	Miller-Meeks	Tenney
Hinson	Mills	Thompson (PA)
Houchin	Molinaro	Tiffany
Hudson	Moolenaar	Timmons
Huizenga	Mooney	Turner
Hunt	Moore (AL)	Valadao
Jackson (TX)	Moore (UT)	Van Drew
James	Moran	Van Dуйne
Johnson (LA)	Murphy	Van Orden
Johnson (OH)	Nehls	Wagner
Johnson (SD)	Newhouse	Walberg
Jordan	Nunn (IA)	Waltz
Joyce (PA)	Obernolte	Weber (TX)
Kean (NJ)	Ogles	Webster (FL)
Kelly (MS)	Owens	Wenstrup
Kelly (PA)	Palmer	Westerman
Kiggans (VA)	Pence	Williams (NY)
Kiley	Perry	Wilson (SC)
Kim (CA)	Pfuger	Wittman
Kustoff	Posey	Womack
LaHood	Reschenthaler	Yakym
LaLota	Rodgers (WA)	Zinke
LaMalfa	Rogers (AL)	
Lamborn	Rogers (KY)	

NAYS—201

Adams	DelBene	Kim (NJ)
Agullar	Deluzio	Krishnamoorthi
Allred	DeSaulnier	Landsman
Auchincloss	Dingell	Larsen (WA)
Balint	Doggett	Larson (CT)
Barragan	Escobar	Lee (CA)
Beatty	Eshoo	Lee (NV)
Bera	Espallat	Lee (PA)
Beyer	Evans	Leger Fernandez
Bishop (GA)	Fletcher	Levin
Blumenauer	Foster	Lieu
Blunt Rochester	Foushee	Lynch
Bonamici	Frankel, Lois	Magaziner
Bowman	Frost	Manning
Boyle (PA)	Gallego	Matsui
Brown	Garamendi	McBath
Brownley	Garcia (TX)	McCollum
Budzinski	Garcia, Robert	McGarvey
Caraveo	Golden (ME)	McGovern
Carbajal	Gomez	Meeks
Cárdenas	Gonzalez,	Menendez
Carson	Vicente	Meng
Carter (LA)	Gottheimer	Mfume
Cartwright	Green, Al (TX)	Moore (WI)
Casar	Grijalva	Morelle
Case	Harder (CA)	Moskowitz
Casten	Hayes	Moulton
Castor (FL)	Higgins (NY)	Mullin
Cherfilus-	Himes	Nadler
McCormick	Horsford	Napolitano
Chu	Houlahan	Neal
Cicilline	Hoyer	Neguse
Clark (MA)	Hoyle (OR)	Nickel
Clarke (NY)	Huffman	Norcross
Clyburn	Ivey	Ocasio-Cortez
Cohen	Jackson (IL)	Omar
Connolly	Jackson (NC)	Pallone
Correa	Jackson Lee	Panetta
Costa	Jacobs	Pappas
Courtney	Jayapal	Pascarell
Craig	Jeffries	Payne
Crockett	Johnson (GA)	Pelosi
Crow	Kamlager-Dove	Peltola
Cuellar	Kaptur	Perez
Davids (KS)	Keating	Peters
Davis (NC)	Kelly (IL)	Petterson
Dean (PA)	Khan	Phillips
DeGette	Kildee	Pingree
DeLauro	Kilmer	Pocan

Porter	Sewell	Tlaib
Pressley	Sherman	Tokuda
Quigley	Sherrill	Tonko
Ramirez	Slotkin	Torres (CA)
Raskin	Smith (WA)	Torres (NY)
Ross	Sorensen	Trahan
Ruiz	Soto	Trone
Ruppersberger	Spanberger	Underwood
Ryan	Stansbury	Vargas
Salinas	Stanton	Vasquez
Sánchez	Stevens	Veasey
Scanlon	Strickland	Velázquez
Schakowsky	Swalwell	Wasserman
Schiff	Sykes	Schultz
Schneider	Takano	Waters
Scholten	Thanedar	Watson Coleman
Schrier	Thompson (CA)	Wexton
Scott (VA)	Thompson (MS)	Williams (GA)
Scott, David	Titus	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Bush	Issa	Norman
Castro (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kuster	Steube
Crane	Letlow	Wild
Davis (IL)	Lofgren	Williams (TX)
Garcia (IL)	Luttrell	
Goldman (NY)	Mrvan	

□ 1353

Ms. TITUS, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. HOULAHAN, CLARKE of New York, Messrs. CORREA, BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. KAPTUR, DELAURO, and Mr. COURTNEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BERGMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. LETLOW. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 122.

Stated against:

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 122.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 205, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]
AYES—216

Aderholt	Boebert	Clyde
Alford	Bost	Cole
Allen	Brecheen	Collins
Amodei	Buchanan	Comer
Armstrong	Buck	Crawford
Arrington	Bucshon	Crenshaw
Babin	Burchett	Curtis
Bacon	Burgess	D'Esposito
Baird	Burlison	Davidson
Balderson	Calvert	De La Cruz
Banks	Cammack	DesJarlais
Barr	Carey	Diaz-Balart
Bean (FL)	Carl	Donalds
Bentz	Carter (GA)	Duarte
Bergman	Carter (TX)	Duncan
Bice	Chavez-DeRemer	Dunn (FL)
Biggs	Ciscomani	Edwards
Bilirakis	Cline	Ellzey
Bishop (NC)	Cloud	Emmer

Estes	Kelly (MS)	Perry	Mullin	Ross	Sykes
Ezell	Kelly (PA)	Pfluger	Nadler	Ruiz	Takano
Fallon	Kiggans (VA)	Posey	Napolitano	Ruppersberger	Thanedar
Feenstra	Kiley	Reschenthaler	Neal	Ryan	Thompson (CA)
Ferguson	Kim (CA)	Rodgers (WA)	Neguse	Salinas	Thompson (MS)
Finstad	Kustoff	Rogers (AL)	Nickel	Sánchez	Titus
Fischbach	LaHood	Rogers (KY)	Norcross	Scanlon	Tlaib
Fitzgerald	LaLota	Rose	Ocasio-Cortez	Schakowsky	Tokuda
Fitzpatrick	LaMalfa	Rosendale	Omar	Schiff	Tonko
Fleischmann	Lamborn	Rouzer	Pallone	Schneider	Torres (CA)
Flood	Langworthy	Roy	Panetta	Scholten	Torres (NY)
Foxx	Latta	Rutherford	Pappas	Schrier	Trahan
Franklin, C.	LaTurner	Salazar	Pascarell	Scott (VA)	Trone
Scott	Lawler	Santos	Payne	Scott, David	Underwood
Fry	Lee (FL)	Scalise	Pelosi	Sewell	Vargas
Fulcher	Lesko	Schweikert	Peltola	Sherman	Vasquez
Gaetz	Letlow	Scott, Austin	Perez	Sherrill	Veasey
Gallagher	Loudermilk	Self	Peters	Slotkin	Velázquez
Garbarino	Lucas	Pettersen	Smith (WA)	Smith (WA)	Wasserman
Garcia, Mike	Luetkemeyer	Phillips	Sorensen	Soto	Schultz
Gimenez	Luna	Pingree	Spanberger	Spanberger	Waters
Gonzales, Tony	Mace	Pocan	Stansbury	Stanton	Watson Coleman
Good (VA)	Malliotakis	Porter	Stanton	Stevens	Wexton
Gooden (TX)	Mann	Pressley	Stanton	Strickland	Williams (GA)
Gosar	Massie	Smucker	Stanton	Swalwell	Wilson (FL)
Granger	Mast	Spartz	Stanton		
Graves (LA)	McCarthy	Stauber	Ramirez		
Graves (MO)	McCaul	Steel	Raskin		
Green (TN)	McClain	Stefanik			
Greene (GA)	McClintock	Steil	Castro (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Weber (TX)
Griffith	McCormick	Stewart	Cleaver	Loftgren	Wild
Grothman	McHenry	Strong	Crane	Luttrell	Williams (TX)
Guest	Meuser	Tenney	Davis (IL)	Sarbanes	
Guthrie	Miller (IL)	Thompson (PA)	Garcia (IL)	Steube	
Hageman	Miller (OH)	Tiffany			
Harris	Miller (WV)	Timmons			
Harshbarger	Miller-Meeks	Turner			
Hern	Mills	Valadao			
Higgins (LA)	Molinaro	Van Drew			
Hill	Moolenaar	Van Dwyne			
Hinson	Mooney	Van Orden			
Houchin	Moore (AL)	Wagner			
Hudson	Moore (UT)	Walberg			
Huizenga	Moran	Waltz			
Hunt	Murphy	Webster (FL)			
Issa	Nehls	Wenstrup			
Jackson (TX)	Newhouse	Westerman			
James	Norman	Williams (NY)			
Johnson (LA)	Nunn (IA)	Wilson (SC)			
Johnson (OH)	Obornolte	Wittman			
Johnson (SD)	Ogles	Womack			
Jordan	Owens	Yakym			
Joyce (PA)	Palmer	Zinke			
Kean (NJ)	Pence				

NOES—205

Adams	Crow	Jackson (IL)
Aguilar	Cuellar	Jackson (NC)
Allred	Davidson (KS)	Jackson Lee
Auchincloss	Davis (NC)	Jacobs
Balint	Dean (PA)	Jayapal
Barragán	DeGette	Jeffries
Beatty	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
Bera	DelBene	Kamlaager-Dove
Beyer	Deluzio	Kaptur
Bishop (GA)	DeSaulnier	Keating
Blumenauer	Dingell	Kelly (IL)
Blunt Rochester	Doggett	Khanna
Bonamici	Escobar	Kildee
Bowman	Eshoo	Kilmer
Boyle (PA)	Españillat	Kim (NJ)
Brown	Evans	Krishnamoorthi
Brownley	Fletcher	Kuster
Budzinski	Foster	Landsman
Bush	Foushee	Larsen (WA)
Caraveo	Frankel, Lois	Larson (CT)
Carbajal	Frost	Lee (CA)
Cárdenas	Gallego	Lee (NV)
Carson	Garamendi	Lee (PA)
Carter (LA)	Garcia (TX)	Leger Fernandez
Cartwright	Garcia, Robert	Levin
Casas	Golden (ME)	Lieu
Case	Goldman (NY)	Lynch
Casten	Gomez	Magaziner
Castor (FL)	Gonzalez,	Manning
Cherfilus	Vicente	Matsui
McCormick	Gottheimer	McBath
Chu	Green, Al (TX)	McCollum
Cicilline	Grijalva	McGarvey
Clark (MA)	Harder (CA)	McGovern
Clarke (NY)	Hayes	Meeks
Clyburn	Higgins (NY)	Menendez
Cohen	Himes	Meng
Connolly	Horsford	Mfume
Correa	Houlihan	Moore (WI)
Costa	Hoyer	Morelle
Courtney	Hoyle (OR)	Moskowitz
Craig	Huffman	Moulton
Crockett	Ivey	Mrvan

Ross	Sykes
Ruiz	Takano
Ruppersberger	Thanedar
Ryan	Thompson (CA)
Salinas	Thompson (MS)
Sánchez	Titus
Scanlon	Tlaib
Schakowsky	Tokuda
Schiff	Tonko
Schneider	Torres (CA)
Scholten	Torres (NY)
Schrier	Trahan
Scott (VA)	Trone
Scott, David	Underwood
Sewell	Vargas
Sherman	Vasquez
Sherrill	Veasey
Slotkin	Velázquez
Smith (WA)	Wasserman
Sorensen	Schultz
Soto	Waters
Spanberger	Watson Coleman
Stansbury	Wexton
Stanton	Williams (GA)
Stevens	Wilson (FL)
Strickland	
Swalwell	

NOT VOTING—13

Castro (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Weber (TX)
Cleaver	Loftgren	Wild
Crane	Luttrell	Williams (TX)
Davis (IL)	Sarbanes	
Garcia (IL)	Steube	

□ 1401

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RELATING TO "PRUDENCE AND LOYALTY IN SELECTING PLAN INVESTMENTS AND EXERCISING SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS"

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 166, I call up joint resolution (H.J. Res. 30) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO). Pursuant to House Resolution 166, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 30

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights" (87 Fed. Reg. 73822 (December 1, 2022)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 30, a Congressional Review Act resolution nullifying the Biden administration's attempt to politicize the retirement savings of Americans.

ESG investing puts the future of millions of Americans in jeopardy. Due to Biden's reckless economic policies, too many Americans are worried about the rising costs of living. Diverting retirement savings to fund social justice causes will make this problem even worse. For current retirees, the situation is especially salient.

Last year, the Biden Department of Labor published a rule allowing retirement plan fiduciaries to consider environmental, social, and governance, ESG, factors for making investment decisions and exercising shareholder rights.

The rule removed commonsense protections for retirement savings established by the Trump administration, which ensured that retirement plan fiduciaries evaluate investments and exercise shareholder rights based only on the financial benefits to participants and beneficiaries. That is what retirement savers expect.

Now, thanks to Democrats, workers can be placed into ESG investment vehicles by default. If a fiduciary finds that two investments are equal, the fiduciary is allowed to use collateral ESG factors to break the tie without justifying or documenting that decision.

While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have argued that the Biden rule is neutral, they have done a poor job of hiding the administration's true intentions.

The Department issued the rule in response to two executive orders on climate change and the explanation of the rule is littered with Democrats' preferred political projects, such as labor relations, climate change, and workforce and corporate diversity.

Further, DOL officials have repeatedly stated that they will pursue additional actions concerning ESG and retirement plans.

The left is using ESG investment criteria as a political tool to cudgel companies into accepting leftist policies. This is how the left always operates. This is just the first step.

If we let this continue, the left will use ESG investing to push noncompliant companies out of the marketplace. This is pernicious and it is hypocritical.

It is unacceptable to encourage fiduciaries to sacrifice the savings of Americans to the orthodoxy of the woke left. In fact, this is prohibited under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, ERISA, as affirmed by the Supreme Court.

Yet, the Biden administration's rule permitting and encouraging retirement plan fiduciaries to consider ESG when investing workers' savings flips ERISA on its head.

By paving the way for ESG investing in employer-sponsored retirement plans, President Biden is threatening the retirement savings of Americans. Such a fundamental change to ERISA should be debated and considered in Congress, not enacted through executive fiat illegally. Americans invest to secure their future, not to fund the Green New Deal or leftist pet projects.

Fiduciaries governed by ERISA should not be allowed to make investments they know will not pay off. A fiduciary's most important responsibility is to make investments that are in the financial interests of workers and retirees.

It is time to stop this madness. That is why I support the resolution to nullify the Biden administration's destructive retirement plan rule.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to put workers and retirees above politics and vote for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 30, a Congressional Review Act joint resolution of disapproval to nullify a popular and sensible rule issued by the Biden-Harris administration last year.

Workers should be able to invest their retirement savings in a way that reflects their values, such as combating climate change, without sacrificing investment returns.

That is why the Biden-Harris administration issued a rule to clarify that retirement plan fiduciaries may consider the economic effects of climate change and other environmental, social, and governance factors, or ESG factors, when they make investment decisions for participants in retirement plans.

Now, to be clear, this rule is not an ESG mandate.

Additionally, the rule does not change the fiduciary standard to which professionals who make investment decisions for retirement plans are bound. They must still prioritize the interests of retirement plan participants and cannot sacrifice investment returns to pursue ESG goals.

Let's be clear. Consideration of ESG factors is not at odds with making a

profit. In fact, workers' profit is still central, but if a company has negative externalities, such as carbon-intensive business practices, vulnerability to sea level rise, high liability risks, or a record of mistreating workers who may go on strike, its stock could suffer in the long term.

□ 1415

Workers often contribute to their retirement for decades before drawing down on their savings, so it makes sense that retirement plan beneficiaries must consider the long-term time horizon when making investment decisions.

Finally, there is widespread support for the Biden-Harris administration's rule. Of the comment letters submitted on the proposed rule, 83 percent of the letters submitted by institutions like corporations, financial firms, and labor organizations supported the rule.

Over 97 percent of the letters submitted by individuals supported the rule. Simply put, the Biden-Harris rule reflects the best interests of the American people and our economy.

We should not get rid of this popular and reasonable rule by this resolution. The rule just simply allows retirement plan fiduciaries to appropriately consider ESG factors.

Retirement fiduciaries, not House Republicans, are best positioned and bound by law to make prudent investment decisions on behalf of retirement savers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), the originator of this CRA.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, the chairwoman of the committee, for her leadership in fighting the politicization of capital allocation and the politicization of retirement savings.

Mr. Speaker, today House Republicans stand on the side of retail investors. We stand up for millions of Americans around the country who are increasingly asking themselves this simple question: When will I be able to retire?

This Congressional Review Act measure that I am offering is a bipartisan, bicameral joint resolution, disapproving of a Department of Labor rulemaking that will politicize Americans' retirement accounts and jeopardize their retirement security.

This measure simply states that retirement plan sponsors be required to prioritize maximum financial returns for investors ahead of nonpecuniary factors like environmental, social, and governance standards, a political agenda.

We do so in a moment where one in five Americans have saved nothing for their retirement, including one in three baby boomers, the generation closest to retirement.

We do so in a moment when 78 percent of Americans are either extremely

or somewhat concerned about affording a comfortable retirement.

We do so in a moment where the gap between the amount of money that Americans have saved for retirement and the amount that they will need for retirement is \$3.8 trillion.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, Congress must act to block the Biden administration's recent rule that green-lights so-called ESG investing in millions of Americans' retirement plans, plowing them into less diversified, higher fees, and lower-performing portfolios at precisely the time that we need to maximize financial security for Americans approaching retirement.

So let's consider the facts. According to a recent Wall Street Journal report, ESG funds carry 43 percent higher fees than non-ESG funds.

That is what they want. They want Americans to be forced into higher fee funds. A recent study from NYU and the University of Southern California found that over the past 5 years, global ESG funds have underperformed the broader market by 250 basis points per year, an average of 2.6 percent lower return than non-ESG funds.

This stands to reason because ESG funds are, by design, less diversified. This is investing 101.

When you discriminate against energy stocks, and you are heavy in tech, when you are in a tech sell-off, and when energy underperforms the market, who loses? The American retail investor who is unwittingly invested in these fraudulent, cancerous funds.

This means that an investor who put \$10,000 into an average global ESG fund in 2017 would have realized a \$1,750 lower return than if they had invested in the broader market.

While some of my friends on the other side of the aisle argue that ESG investing is actually driven by investors themselves, not ideologues at asset management firms and the White House who want to push their environmental or social causes at the expense of retail investors, a 2021 study conducted by the University of Chicago and FINRA proves investors largely do not care.

Mr. Speaker, 21 percent of investors don't even know what ESG stands for. Is that popular? Is that what popular ESG is?

And this neutrality nonsense. Look, nobody is saying you can't invest based on your values, but this bill would steer people unwittingly into these funds.

The status quo does not deny people to invest based on their values. It just says that the default has to be to maximize returns.

So, Mr. Speaker, this debate today is not about investor protection. It is about the ability of investors to maximize returns.

It is also about energy security. Even if you don't have a retirement account, this radical ESG movement is hitting your wallet.

Since President Biden took office, his administration has waged a war on

American energy production; not just holding up leases or blocking infrastructure, but through financial regulation and the weaponization of financial regulation to divert resources and capital and financing away from the American energy sector.

There has been a 25 percent decline in investment in natural gas and in oil investments since 2021, and the result? Gas prices are up 40 percent, and diesel prices are almost double.

Household energy costs hit a 10-year high this winter, costing average American families \$1,200, according to a report from the National Energy Assistance Directors Association.

These price hikes and the decline in investment in our energy supply come at the exact time that the Biden administration itself estimates that by 2050, almost half of our Nation's energy supply will be made up of oil and natural gas.

Mr. Speaker, we need more, not less, capital investment and financing of American energy.

I implore the administration. It is time for you to end your assault on energy production that is fueling 40-year high inflation.

We, as Members of Congress, cannot allow this administration to continue to perpetrate their war on American energy at the expense of investors.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN), the co-chair of the Congressional Sustainable Investment Caucus.

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago, more than half of U.S. electricity came from coal. Today, it is less than 20 percent.

We now generate more energy from renewables than from coal. This isn't anti-energy. It is about cheap energy.

In 2022, last year, 10 percent of all vehicle sales in the United States were EVs. That was up from 6 percent the year before, 2 percent the year before that.

ExxonMobil and Chevron today are trading at about 8 to 9 times their earnings. I would compare that to companies like First Solar and Tesla that are trading to 40 to 60 times earnings.

Let me dumb this down for you all. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, if you shifted your investment portfolio away from fossil energy toward climate-friendly investments, you would be richer today.

Now, my Republican colleagues, you all talk a good game about how you are into personal freedom, and yet you are taking individual investors' freedom away from them with this bill.

You all talk a good game about how government should not be picking winners and losers. Why do you all keep picking losers?

In 2011, a guy named Hugo Chavez redirected Venezuelan oil worker pensions into a Ponzi scheme run by a political ally.

My Republican colleagues a couple weeks ago voted to oppose socialism in

all its form. I am thinking that Hugo Chavez guy seems pretty smart. Let's do the same thing.

You know what you call capitalism when you are losing? Woke capitalism.

So if you all are afraid of free markets, if you want to destroy workers' pensions, if you oppose individual freedom, if you want to force your constituents to invest in proven losers, then please vote for this resolution. Be honest about your values.

For everyone else, vote "no." I plan to do so proudly and honestly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 years, one thing has become clear: This administration cares more about advancing its radical Green New Deal agenda than about the financial well-being of the American people.

We have seen it with their energy policy, but the latest example is the Biden administration's rule to inject woke ESG factors into workers' retirement accounts.

Thanks to President Biden's economic policies, workers' retirement savings were down 10 percent in 2022 compared to 2021. Why is this administration doubling down to further jeopardize Americans' retirement?

Retirement plan sponsors have two responsibilities to their clients: maximize returns and minimize risk. The Biden rule would allow asset managers to impose a political agenda on Americans at the expense of retirement savings.

The Biden administration should not be jeopardizing Americans' retirement by allowing plan managers to gamble their savings on ESG funds that have proven to be riskier and charge steeper fees.

That is why I cosponsored this bill with my friend, ANDY BARR, to use our authority to nullify the Biden rule and protect Americans' hard-earned retirement savings from politically motivated mismanagement.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER), the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The Department of Labor's environmental, social, and governance rule is good for retirees, and it is good for the American economy.

Allowing ESG considerations can help financial professionals identify investments that will be sustainable in the long term and in the best interest of their clients.

The rule is not an ESG mandate. It simply clarifies that the professionals who make investment decisions for retirement plans do not violate their fiduciary duties by merely considering ESG factors.

Existing law already says that these professionals' primary purpose is to make the best financial choices for the plans, and this rule does not change that at all.

It merely is a recognition that if a company is inherently risky because of the business they do or their internal practices, its stock could suffer in the long run.

Just like American consumers can be motivated to disinvest from companies that pollute or mistreat their workers, now investors will have the same abilities.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, I have seen overwhelming support for this rule, especially from the financial industry.

Rolling it back would be a significant step backward. I strongly oppose H.J. Res. 30 and encourage all Members to do the same so they can leave retirement plan decisions to the retirees and the professionals they respect and they work with.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today the House can repeal a policy from the Department of Labor that harms Americans who simply want to save for retirement.

This new rule from the Biden administration says that investment decisions in employer-sponsored retirement plans can be based on climate change and other environmental, social, or governance factors.

So typically without the knowledge of the retirees, their investment funds can be invested in underperforming investments that subsidize unreliable and unaffordable energy.

Congress never originally intended for 401Ks to be used to advance the priorities of the phony climate movement or to push a social justice agenda.

They were simply intended to help people to have the resources they need in retirement. If ESG-based stocks are higher performing, they would get those investment dollars anyway without this new rule.

But Americans inherently know that investing should be about evaluating risk and return from a financial point of view.

Hardworking Americans want to know their investments have strong economic fundamentals that will help them build wealth over a lifetime of work.

If Congress is successful in overturning this rule, the investing standard will return to one based on financial factors only.

It is bad enough that Bidenflation has eroded the spending power of many retirement savings accounts. Matter of fact, the average retirement account is down 30 percent over the last 2 years.

Many retirees are having to change their retirement plans or to downsize or to work longer. There is even an increase in the number of Americans who

are borrowing or withdrawing from the retirement accounts before retirement, just trying to make ends meet.

□ 1430

Still, the Department of Labor used executive fiat to leverage trillions of dollars that would be vested in retirement plans to advance their woke agenda that can't pass Congress.

With this vote, Congress can put some checks and balances to work for the American people, and I urge my colleagues in the House and the Senate to protect the retirement plans of hardworking Americans by voting for this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 30.

When we, as Americans, are given the opportunity to know what investments to make, the kind of investments that we can make, and the kind of impacts that they will have, that matters. That choice should always be with each one of us. The investments that we make might have an impact on the rest of the world.

Many of us would be outraged if we knew that our investments went toward forced labor activities in China and other parts of the world. Yet, this resolution would make it difficult for hardworking Americans to determine what investments are being made in their name.

Our constituents deserve the freedom to access this information and to have the right to ensure that their money is being invested in a way that is aligned with their values.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution and protect the rights of Americans to make financial and moral decisions about the kind of investments that they want their retirement to be made of.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad this House joint resolution is before us today. We continue to march toward a different sort of government, and part of that different sort of government is the ESG ideology being imposed or encouraged on America's corporations.

This is an ideological push on corporations, of which there is too much already. Already, particularly big corporations have seminars giving the leftwing view of the environment, the leftwing view of race, the leftwing view of agenda.

This is to further push down on them and say: Here you are, Mr. Big Corporation. We will give you a nice pat on the back if you use all of your stockholders' money to promote a political agenda.

Obviously, that should be offensive to any freedom-loving person in America.

Of course, in addition to that, studies from UCLA and New York University show that the average corporation that engages in this ESG stuff, their market goes up 6.3 percent instead of 8.9 percent, so the shareholders have to pay a price.

To me, secondarily to the shareholders paying a price is this pound, pound, pound that we already get from the universities, that we already get from the popular culture and Hollywood, and now we have to get it from big business, that the traditional, freedom-loving moral values of America are something to be stepped aside, and we, big corporate America, are going to ingratiate ourselves to the leftwing bureaucrats in Washington by following the ESG standards.

I am very grateful that my good friend from North Carolina has let me give this speech, and I sincerely hope everybody stands up for freedom.

The other side of the aisle would not like it if the people who decide what ESG was, was written by JIM JORDAN, okay? Maybe someday that will happen. I don't know.

I liked it better when the big corporations stayed out of this thing, but you want to put the sword over their throat and say: This is the view of the world that you must adopt. You must have seminars and shove it down the throats of your employees.

It will be a bad day for America if this thing doesn't pass.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS), a co-chair of the Congressional Sustainable Investment Caucus.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, many times, things around here get topsyturvy. We have a group here involved in an anticapitalist crusade against free-market principles, attempting to prevent financial institutions from allocating capital in accordance with investors' preferences and risk management priorities.

Under their proposed resolution, investment advisers can no longer consider environmental, social, and governance factors that materially impact a company's performance and bottom line. That means that your hard-earned dollars cannot be adequately invested because you, the American worker, are now exposed to greater risk.

It is interesting it doesn't say that you must invest in ESG. All that the Biden administration says is that you can if you want to.

Whatever happened to capitalistic ideals that you should be able to invest in what you want? You are trying to force people to say: No, you cannot invest looking at a strategy of ESG.

That doesn't make any sense at all. It doesn't make any sense at all. It is anticapitalistic. It is antimarket. We should not support this resolution.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BEAN).

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, he is at it again. President Biden's war on America's energy continues.

It started on day one with the cancellation of the Keystone XL pipeline, and 2 years later, this administration is pushing environmental, social, and governance, or ESG, to clog America's oil and gas production.

The Department of Labor is seeking to weaponize American retirement funds as part of President Biden's anti-fossil fuel agenda, all at the expense of your retirement savings. ESG requirements not only exacerbate high energy costs but also contribute to inflationary woes and weaken our national security.

To be clear, ESG is more government control. ESG is less freedom for Americans. ESG simply is a woke capitalist scam posing as responsible corporate governance, which robs Americans of their hard-earned retirement investments.

It is time to stand against the progressive mob, which only wants an inch but seems to take a mile. Today, we are going to say no. We are going to draw the line and say it ends now.

It is time to stand against the progressive mob and safeguard our Nation's energy independence from the outstretched claws of ESG. A correct vote on the bill today is "yes," as a "yes" vote today says no to ESG.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. MAGAZINER).

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this misguided resolution, which will tie the hands of investors from doing their jobs and will hurt the retirement savings of millions of hardworking Americans.

The evidence is clear. Companies that adopt thoughtful policies to manage their environmental, social, and governance risks outperform those that don't. I will say that again. Companies that have thoughtful policies to manage their environmental, social, and governance risks outperform those that don't.

Don't believe me? Ask the shareholders of BP, whose stock fell more than 50 percent after the Gulf oil spill, wiping out billions of dollars of shareholder value; or Volkswagen, whose stock fell 45 percent after they were caught cheating on emissions tests.

How about Norfolk Southern? They are in the news lately. Their stock is tanking because of their inattention to managing the safety of their operations.

The fact is that environmental, social, and governance issues are financially material to company performance. Any investor who knows what they are doing would be foolish to ignore those factors.

I know this because, as State treasurer and as an investor in the private sector, I have spent the last 10 years studying corporate performance. ESG issues matter.

Even if you don't agree with me, even if you think that environmental and social issues are not material to performance, you ought to at least believe

that, in a free market, investors should have the power to make their own decisions and to choose which factors they think are material or not.

Let them use their professional judgment. Don't try to police what investors are thinking when they are making decisions.

Why is it that the Republican majority, which claims to be the party of limited government and free markets, is abandoning its free-market principles and trying to dictate to investors what they have to think? It makes no sense.

If anyone was wondering what this is about, it is not about free markets. It is not, certainly, about protecting workers' retirement security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. MAGAZINER. I will just say again, let's be honest about what this debate is really about. It is not about protecting worker retirement savings. If we were serious about that, we would be saying that ESG is material and should be considered.

It is not about free-market principles.

Could it be that it has to do with the oil and gas industry pouring tens of millions of dollars into campaign accounts on the Republican side? Could that be what is driving this?

Well, I think we see now where the priorities of our colleagues on the Republican side lie—not with workers, not with free-market principles, but with doing the bidding of the oil and gas industry.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't understand the existing law and what this resolution does and what the Department of Labor's new rule is, or whether they are just trying to confuse the listeners and watchers here today because the truth is that this is not material for the vast majority of Americans.

The studies show that most Americans don't even know what ESG is. To the extent Americans do find it material, nothing in this resolution prohibits an American from allocating their capital the way they want to.

What this resolution will do is stop the Department of Labor from coercing Americans into lower performing, higher fee, less diversified, politicized funds. We must stop the politicization of allocation of capital.

When my friend from Illinois says: Well, why are Republicans picking losers? Really?

In 2022, the S&P 500 energy sector ended the year a whopping 59 percent higher than where it started. Amid a brutal bear market in which the S&P 500 overall lost 20 percent, if you were invested in ESG in 2022, you were a

massive loser because you were divested from energy.

Stop the politicization of capital. If you want to give Americans freedom to choose what is material for them in investing, vote against the Department of Labor rule, which would conceal what the Department of Labor is doing, which is steering Americans into investments that have political values that they disagree with.

Give Americans true transparency. Go back to the Department of Labor rule under the Trump administration, which says the default should always be consistent with ERISA, maximizing financial performance.

If you want an alternative, if you want to subordinate financial returns to the environment, to climate change, to social justice, to whatever, and you really don't care about your retirement security, then you can choose that.

Let the American investor decide, and the default should always be maximum investor returns.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is a little ironic that our side of the aisle is being accused of being anti-capitalist and anti-free market. I would like to clarify for the record the content of the Trump Department of Labor rule on retirement plan ESG investing.

Under the Trump rule, if a fiduciary finds that an ESG factor is a pecuniary or financial factor, it can be considered when investing and exercising shareholder rights.

□ 1445

Here are a few excerpts of the Trump rule, to set the record straight:

"Nothing in the final rule is intended to or does prevent a fiduciary from appropriately considering any material risk with respect to an investment."

Another quote: "The ERISA fiduciary duty of prudence requires portfolio-level attention to risk and return objectives reasonably suited to the purpose of the account, diversification, cost sensitivity, documentation, and ongoing monitoring."

"The proposal was not intended to suggest that these principles apply other than neutrally to all investment decisions. . . ."

To suggest that the Trump rule barred a fiduciary from appropriately considering any factor that may be material to an investment is blatantly false. If anything, the Trump rule was neutral as to the prudent decisions of fiduciaries.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. Speaker, during this debate, we have heard a lot about ESG investing. It is clear there is a difference of opinion on it, but whether Members of Con-

gress see things the same way is not the point.

What matters is that the Biden-Harris rule puts the decisionmaking when it comes to considering ESG factors where it belongs, in the hands of retirement plan fiduciaries who are best positioned and bound by law, which has not changed, to act prudently on behalf of plan participants. That is where the decisionmaking should stay.

They, not Members of Congress, know what is in the best interests of their plan participants, and they are bound by their fiduciary responsibilities to do the right thing.

Now, when supporters say that a fiduciary should not consider nonpecuniary factors, they ignore the fact that ESG factors can, in fact, be pecuniary, because often ESG factors, such as sea level rise, can have a profound effect on the value of the investment. Those who recognize this should be able to make reasonable investments based on that knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD several letters from organizations opposed to H.J. Res. 30. Eighty-three percent of institutions that submitted comments were in favor of the underlying rule. These organizations, who are opposed to H.J. Res. 30, include the AFL-CIO, Americans for Financial Reform, Public Citizen, SEIU, Environmental Defense Fund, League of Conservation Voters, Sierra Club, Natural Resources Defense Council, Union of Concerned Scientists, and others.

AFL-CIO,
LEGISLATIVE ALERT,
February 16, 2023.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the AFL-CIO, we urge you to oppose the Congressional Review Act joint resolution that has been introduced by Sen. Mike Braun and Rep. Andy Barr to disapprove of the Department of Labor's recently adopted rule "Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights" (S.J. Res. 8, H.J. Res. 30).

The Department of Labor's rule clarifies that private sector retirement plan fiduciaries may consider environmental, social and governance ("ESG") factors when making plan investments or voting proxies. The rule does not require that retirement plan fiduciaries consider ESG factors, it simply acknowledges the fact that ESG factors may be relevant to investment returns.

Indeed, the consideration of ESG factors helps protect the hard-earned retirement savings of working people. ESG risks are particularly relevant for long-term investors, such as retirement plans, who are investing over the expected lifespans of their participants and beneficiaries. For this reason, ignoring ESG risks to an investment portfolio may be financially imprudent.

Contrary to what some would have you believe, investment professionals' consideration of ESG factors is not limited to environmental risks, such as climate change. Social issues such as respect for workers' rights and governance issues such as having responsible executive compensation can also impact sustainable investment returns.

The rule affirms that proxy votes should be cast in the best interests of plan participants and beneficiaries, thereby giving workers' retirement savings a voice in corporate decision making. The rule also ensures that the default investment for defined contribution

plans is the best option available regardless of whether the investment considers ESG factors.

Finally, the rule clarifies when retirement plan fiduciaries may consider benefits other than investment returns. These benefits can include the creation of good jobs, affordable housing, and economic growth for local communities. Such benefits may only be considered as tiebreakers between competing investments that equally serve the financial interests of the plan.

This rule makes clear that any consideration of ESG factors must be consistent with the fiduciary duties of loyalty and care. Retirement plan fiduciaries cannot sacrifice risk-adjusted investment returns under any circumstances. The rule appropriately holds the consideration of ESG factors to the exact same documentation requirements as any other fiduciary decision.

The decision of whether to consider ESG factors should be left to investment professionals, not politicians. Trillions of dollars in assets under management already take ESG factors into consideration when making investment decisions. Congress should not interfere in the free market by seeking to prohibit the consideration of ESG factors.

For these reasons, we strongly urge you to oppose disapproval of the Department of Labor's rule "Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights." Congress should not play politics with our pension plans by repealing this commonsense rule.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director, Government Affairs.

AMERICANS FOR FINANCIAL REFORM,
February 24, 2023.

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
Senate Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Chairman BERNIE SANDERS,
HELP Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Chairwoman VIRGINIA FOXX,
Education and the Workforce Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Senate Minority Leader,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
House Minority Leader,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Ranking Member BILL CASSIDY,
HELP Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Ranking Member BOBBY SCOTT,
Education and Workforce Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATE MAJORITY LEADER SCHUMER, SENATE MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, HOUSE SPEAKER MCCARTHY, HOUSE MINORITY LEADER JEFFRIES, HELP COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN SANDERS, HELP RANKING MEMBER CASSIDY, HOUSE EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE COMMITTEE CHAIRWOMAN FOXX, AND HOUSE EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE COMMITTEE RANKING MEMBER SCOTT: The undersigned organizations urge you to defend the Department of Labor's important fiduciary rule that safeguards the savings of millions of workers who participate in private-sector employee benefit plans. The rule, titled "Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights," has four main components: 1) removes costly and impractical record-keeping burdens on fiduciaries to ensure those who manage workers' money have the flexibility needed to consider all financially relevant risks and opportunities; 2) allows consider-

ation of collateral benefits such as creating union jobs only if different investment options equally serve the financial interests of the plan over the appropriate time horizon; 3) increases workers' investment choices within the confines of ERISA's stringent protections; and 4) removes costly and unnecessary barriers to the exercise of shareholder rights.

A vote in favor of a Congressional Review Act (CRA) resolution to nullify the rule is an affirmative vote for unworkable, burdensome Trump-era rules. Trump-era rules erected "needless barriers" and had a "chilling effect . . . on considering environmental, social and governance factors in investments" that are financially relevant. The Trump rules also put the thumb on the scale against workers' ability to exercise their shareholder rights, diluting workers' shareholder voice. Additionally, three lawyers, all experts in ERISA, recently published a paper that included an in-depth analysis of why the distinction between "pecuniary" and "non-pecuniary," first introduced in the Trump-era rules and "roundly criticized during the rule-making comment process," is self-contradictory and unworkable.

The Biden DOL rule repeatedly affirms the core ERISA tenet: that fiduciaries are not allowed to sacrifice returns in the pursuit of collateral benefits. The Biden rule returns power to fiduciaries to make the best decisions regarding relevant risks and returns in their participants' best interests, in contrast to the Trump-era rules, which sought to inject politics into fiduciary decision-making.

The CRA resolution is part of a larger, failing effort to imbue "ESG" with false meaning, vilify it, and legislate against it. This effort is backed by powerful corporate interests—including fossil fuel companies looking to postpone the inevitable decarbonization of the economy—that are attempting to roll back progress that has been made on climate change, workers' rights, racial equity, and other ESG issues with clear financial implications. They are doing so by pushing legislation and other policies that hurt both workers' hard-fought pensions and taxpayers.

This effort is unpopular—with 63 percent of voters agreeing the government should not set limits on corporate ESG investments, including 70 percent of Republicans and 57 percent of Democrats—and has suffered numerous, recent failures including: 1) Indiana's budget office finding that a bill forcing pension funds to divest from asset managers that consider ESG factors would cost \$6.7 billion over the next decade in sub-market returns, force retirees to increase their contributions, and impose an additional \$550,000 administrative costs a year; 2) Arizona Attorney General Kris Mayes announcing Arizona will no longer participate in investigations into banks and other financial institutions over ESG investing practices, stating that she believes "it is not the place of government to tell corporations and their investors that they cannot invest in sustainable technologies and practices or improve their governance processes; 3) a study finding that a 2021 Texas investment blacklist would cost municipalities an additional \$303 million to \$532 million in bond interest; and 4) North Dakota voting down, 90-3, a Texas-style bill that would have required the state treasurer to prepare a blacklist of financial firms that have committed to reducing carbon emissions.

For all the reasons stated above, we urge you to protect workers' pensions from anti-ESG attacks and vote no on the CRA resolution. For further discussion, please contact Natalia Renta.

Sincerely,

Americans for Financial Reform; Public Citizen; 1worker1vote; 350Hawaii; 7 Direc-

tions of Service; Abacus Wealth Partners; Adrian Dominican Sisters, Portfolio Advisory Board; American Family Voices; American Sustainable Business Network; As You Sow; B Lab U.S. & Canada; California Reinvestment Coalition; Change Finance; Change the Chamber; Climate Finance Action; Climate Hawks Vote.

Community Development Venture Capital Alliance; Congregation of St. Joseph; Connecticut Citizen Action Group (CCAG); Consumer Federation of America; Daughters of Charity, Province of St. Louise; Demand Progress; Divest Oregon; Earth Action, Inc.; Earthjustice; Florida for Good; Fresh Water Accountability Project; Future Nexus; Green America; Harrington Investments, Inc.; Honor the Earth; Intentional Endowments Network.

Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility (ICCR); Kingdom Living Temple Church; League of Conservation Voters; Mercy Investment Services, Inc.; Montana Environmental Information Center; National Community Investment Fund; National Employment Law Project; Natural Investments LLC; New Alpha Community Development Corporation; NYU Stem Center for Business and Human Rights; Oil & Gas Action Network; Omidyar Network; Opportunity Finance Network; Oxfam America; Pensions & Investment Research Consultants, Ltd.; Physicians for Social Responsibility—Pennsylvania.

Predistribution Initiative; Rabbis and Cantors Retirement Plan; Revolving Door Project; Rights CoLab; Sciencecorps; Seventh Generation Interfaith Coalition for Responsible Investment; Sierra Club; Shareholder Rights Group; SOC Investment Group; Socially Responsible Investment Coalition; The B Team; Tonic Institute; Trillium Asset Management; Union of Concerned Scientists; U.S. Impact Investing Alliance; Whitney M. Slater Foundation; Zero Hour.

SEIU,

Washington, DC, February 21, 2023.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the two million members of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), I write to oppose S.J. Res. 8 and H.J. Res. 30, the Congressional Review Act joint resolution(s) that have been introduced by Senator Mike Braun and Rep. Andy Barr to disapprove of the Department of Labor's recently adopted rule entitled "Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights." The rule clarifies that private sector retirement plan fiduciaries may consider environmental, social and governance ("ESG") factors when making plan investments or voting proxies. The rule does not require that retirement plan fiduciaries consider ESG factors, it simply acknowledges the fact that ESG factors may be relevant to investment returns. Further retirement plan fiduciaries cannot sacrifice risk-adjusted investment returns under any circumstances. The rule appropriately holds the consideration of ESG factors to the exact same documentation requirements as any other fiduciary decision.

The consideration of ESG factors helps protect the hard-earned retirement savings of working people. ESG risks are particularly relevant for long-term investors, such as retirement plans, who are investing over the expected lifespans of their participants and beneficiaries. Ignoring ESG risks, or pretending that they don't exist, may be financially imprudent to an investment portfolio and could end up with long term consequences. Contrary to outlandish claims by those who oppose the rule, investment professionals' consideration of ESG factors that could impact sustainable investment returns is not limited to environmental risks, such

as climate change, but could also include other societal issues such as respect for workers' rights, or even governance issues such as having responsible executive compensation.

The rule also affirms that proxy votes should be cast in the best interests of plan participants and beneficiaries, therefore giving workers' retirement savings a voice in corporate decision making. The rule also ensures that the default investment for defined contribution plans is the best option available regardless of whether the investment considers ESG factors. Finally, the rule clarifies when retirement plan fiduciaries may consider benefits other than investment returns. These benefits can include the creation of good jobs, affordable housing, and economic growth for local communities. These benefits may only be considered as tiebreakers between competing investments that equally serve the financial interests of the plan.

The rule makes clear that any consideration of ESG factors must be consistent with the fiduciary duties of loyalty and care. The decision of whether to consider ESG factors should be left to investment professionals, and Congress should not interfere by prohibiting the consideration of ESG factors. For these reasons, we urge you to oppose and vote against S.J. Res. 8 and H.J. Res. 30. We will add any votes on this legislation to our legislative scorecard for the 118th Congress.

Sincerely,

JOHN GRAY,
Legislative Director.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 27, 2023.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: Americans work hard for their retirement savings and need to be able to trust that their 401(k) and pension plans can be managed to prudently account for all financial risks. That is why the Department of Labor (DOL) issued a rule in November 2022 to ensure that retirement plan managers can consider all factors relevant to investment risk and return in their decision-making, including financial risks due to climate change. H.J. Res. 30, the Congressional Review Act (CRA) resolution to block the DOL rule, is a threat to Americans' retirement savings. Our organizations urge all Representatives to oppose H.J. Res. 30.

Congress passed the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) to protect the hard earned retirement savings upon which workers and their families rely. For decades, DOL's ERISA rules set forth retirement plan managers' core duty to prudently consider all relevant factors, while remaining neutral on investment types. In 2020, the Trump Administration deviated from this longstanding approach by issuing ERISA rules that discouraged consideration of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) factors—even when these factors affect investment risk and return.

The 2022 DOL rule under ERISA returns to neutrality, in which plan managers can consider all relevant factors to assess investment risk. The rule does not mandate, prohibit, encourage, or discourage any particular type of investment. The rule is clear that retirement plan managers must base their decisions on financial risk-return factors. Those financial factors may include the financial risks and economic impacts of changing climate and other environmental, social and governance factors.

The DOL rule is supported by diverse groups including the AFL-CIO, investment managers like Vanguard and TIAA, and the American Retirement Association. President Bush's Assistant Secretary of Labor, Bradford Campbell stated that "the new rule is more consistent with the regulatory history

than the 2020 rule was." Public comments submitted demonstrate overwhelming and broad support for the Department of Labor rule.

The DOL rule restores plan managers' freedom to consider all financially relevant factors, including financial risks due to climate change, so they can offer prudent investment choices to workers. American workers deserve no less.

Congress: protect Americans' retirement savings by voting NO on this CRA resolution H.J. Res. 30.

Sincerely,

Environmental Defense Fund, League of Conservation Voters, Americans for Financial Reform, California Reinvestment Coalition, Center for American Progress, Ceres Accelerator for Sustainable Capital Markets, Change the Chamber, Clean Water Action, Climate Action Campaign, Climate Hawks Vote, Earthjustice, Evergreen Action, Natural Resources Defense Council, Public Citizen, Sierra Club, Union of Concerned Scientists, WWF.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, these organizations have diverse missions, but they all agree that H.J. Res. 30 should be rejected.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two letters from financial services firms who submitted supportive comments on the underlying rule. These firms are BNY Mellon Investment Management and Lazard Asset Management, who have trillions of dollars in assets under management.

BNY MELLON,
December 13, 2021.

OFFICE OF REGULATIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS,

Employee Benefits Security Administration,
U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, DC.

On behalf of BNY Mellon Investment Management, thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the notice of proposed rulemaking entitled "Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights" (the "Proposal") published by the U.S. Department of Labor (the "Department"). We strongly support the Department's efforts to clarify the regulatory treatment of environmental, social, and governance ("ESG") factors under Title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended ("ERISA") following the publication of "Financial Factors in Selecting Plan Investments" and "Fiduciary Duties Regarding Proxy Voting and Shareholder Rights" (together, the "Current Rules"). To continue the Department's efforts to add clarity to the use of ESG factors by fiduciaries we suggest the Department add clarification in the rule or preamble that a fiduciary can use a screen to consider ESG factors based on the fiduciary's determination that a particular ESG factor will impact investment value consistent with Section 2550.404a-1(c)(2) of the Proposal.

BNY Mellon Investment Management is a division of BNY Mellon, one of the world's largest financial services groups. With a presence in 35 countries, BNY Mellon looks to connect investors with opportunities across every major asset class. BNY Mellon Investment Management encompasses BNY Mellon's affiliated investment firms and global distribution companies, constituting over \$2.3 trillion in AUM (as of September 30, 2021).

BNY Mellon Investment Management follows a multi-boutique investment management model that weds the specialist expertise from its investment firms offering solutions across every major asset class, backed by the strength, stewardship, and global

presence of BNY Mellon. Each investment firm has its own unique culture, investment philosophy, and proprietary investment processes, and provides a global perspective. Our seven majority owned investment firms, are as follows (all AUM figures as of September 30, 2021): Alcentra (\$41.0B), ARX (\$7.0B), Dreyfus Cash Investment Strategies (\$342.7B), Insight Investment (\$1,100.0B), Mellon (\$448.6B), Newton Investment Management (\$139.1B), and Walter Scott (\$99.9B).

At BNY Mellon Investment Management our Responsible Investment (RI) approach varies across our investment firms, but the effective stewardship of our clients' assets is common to all and core to our own purpose. Many products or solutions offered by BNY Mellon Investment Management examine ESG factors in their investment processes and decision-making to better manage risk and generate sustainable long-term returns. Six of our investment firms—Alcentra, ARX, Insight, Mellon, Newton, and Walter Scott—are signatories of the Principles for Responsible Investment ("PRI").

As we have noted in a previous comment letter, over the past decades, fiduciaries and investment managers have come to appreciate the materiality that ESG factors can have on investment value. We welcome the Department's clarifications to the Current Rules regarding the use of ESG factors and the exercise of shareholder rights. The acknowledgement by the Department that climate risks and other ESG factors can be and often are material to investment risk and returns will better allow fiduciaries to mitigate risk and enhance returns based on evaluating ESG factors.

Within the last decade, a deep body of research has been produced that demonstrates the material influence of ESG factors on the profitability of an enterprise and the performance of its securities. For example, weak control of environmental activities such as pollution, over-consumption of raw materials or lack of recycling of waste materials readily leads to volatile or lower achieved margins or financial penalties that reduce investor returns. Similarly with social issues: high staff turnover, high strike rates or absenteeism or death or injury rates have all been linked to lower productivity and poor quality control. Regarding governance, we know from years of empirical observation that poorly managed issuers can seriously damage investor returns. To ignore the entire category of information and analysis that comprise ESG factors, therefore, could be deemed an abrogation of a fiduciary's responsibility to consider all material information when assessing the risk and return of any investment opportunity.

The Proposal appropriately balances the materiality that ESG factors can have on investment value with the Department's longstanding principles that a fiduciary's duties of prudence and loyalty require the fiduciary to consider factors that are material to investment value. In particular, a fiduciary should not subordinate the interests of plan participants and beneficiaries to other objectives, nor sacrifice investment return or take on additional investment risk to promote goals unrelated to the plan and its participants and beneficiaries. We specifically believe that the proposed removal of the definition of "pecuniary factors" and the revision to the Current Rules providing that a fiduciary's evaluation of an investment or investment course of action should be based on factors that "are material to investment value" both clarifies the rule and ensures that the rule reflects the analysis performed by fiduciaries when making investment decisions.

We also support the removal of the special rule prohibiting certain investment alternatives from being considered qualified default investment alternatives (QDIA) because the investment references ESG factors. The QDIA restrictions in the Current Rules add uncertainty and would be difficult to apply. We agree with the Department that there is not a reason to prohibit fiduciaries from prudently selecting a fund that meets the QDIA requirements and includes the consideration of ESG factors.

We support the Department's efforts to reduce the uncertainty in the market caused by the Current Rules and we suggest additional clarification regarding the use of screens. We believe this clarification could further reduce uncertainty that might otherwise prevent fiduciaries from considering ESG factors which are expected to enhance investment value and performance or improve investment portfolio resilience against the potential financial risks.

As noted above, we support the removal of "pecuniary factors" and that a fiduciary's evaluation of an investment or investment course of action should be based on factors that "are material to investment value". We think that the Department could add additional clarity to the rule or preamble by clarifying that the proposed rule does not per se prohibit a fiduciary from using a screen on investments based in whole or in part on ESG factors.

A common method used by investment managers to incorporate ESG factors into the assessment of investment risks and returns is the use of screens. As described in the Proposal, "negative screening refers to the exclusion of certain sectors, companies, or practices from a fund or portfolio based on ESG criteria." The Proposal's discussion of the benefits that can occur from the use of ESG factors in the assessment of investment risks and returns relies on sources that studied the impact of investment managers using screens based on ESG factors. However, the Current Rules and some past guidance regarding the use of ESG factors could be read to preclude the use of screens based on ESG factors.

We suggest that the Department clarify in the final rule or its preamble that the investment prudence duties and the investment loyalty duties under Sections 2550.404a-1(b) and 2550.404a-1(c), respectively, do not per se prohibit the use of screens. For example, it should be permissible for a plan fiduciary to select investment managers and funds that use screens to the extent that doing so would otherwise be consistent with its duties. It should similarly be permissible for any such investment manager to select an "investment course of action" that uses a screen to the extent that the resulting investment strategy would otherwise be consistent with its duties. Such a clarification would provide certainty to fiduciaries seeking to use ESG factors in the assessment of investment risks and returns in accordance with their prudence and loyalty duties. It would further ensure that plan participants realize the full benefits of fiduciaries using ESG factors as described in the Proposal.

We strongly support the Department's efforts to bring clarity to the use of ESG factors and the exercise of shareholder rights by plan fiduciaries. We believe the Proposal and the changes suggested here will promote retirement income security and further retirement savings by allowing fiduciaries to better manage risks and improve investment returns.

Sincerely,

HANNEKE SMITS,
Chief Executive Officer,
BNY Mellon Investment Management.

LAZARD ASSET MANAGEMENT,
December 12, 2021.

OFFICE OF REGULATIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS,

*Employee Benefits Security Administration,
U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM OR SIR: Lazard Asset Management LLC ("LAM") submits the following comments regarding the above-referenced proposal to amend the Investment Duties regulation under Title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended ("ERISA"). See Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights, 29 CFR Part 2550, RIN 1210-AC03 (October 14, 2021), 86 Fed. Reg. 57272 (the "Proposed Rule").

LAM is pleased that the Department recognizes that climate change and other ESG factors are often material to the assessment of investment risks and returns. We agree with the Department that the changes proposed not only would clarify the duties of plan fiduciaries when selecting investment options, but also would help individuals build retirement income security and retirement savings. In particular, we believe that the Proposed Rule, if adopted, will provide plans with the freedom to leverage the advances that active asset managers have contributed to ESG analysis and investing in recent years.

LAM is an investment adviser registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission, with more than \$239.8 billion of assets under management as of September 30, 2021. We manage assets on a discretionary basis for a large number of global clients, including a variety of U.S. defined benefit plans, defined contribution plans, individual retirement accounts, and variable annuity portfolios.

LAM's investment decisions are based on proprietary fundamental and quantitative research techniques that our professionals have developed over decades. Our firm seeks to manage client portfolios in a way that delivers investment performance, maximizes long-term shareholder value, and limits unwanted risks—including the risks presented by ESG factors.

The Proposed Rule would allow plan fiduciaries to consider a wider variety of factors when evaluating plan investment options under Section 404(a) of ERISA, which sets forth the standards of prudence that an ERISA fiduciary must satisfy when selecting investments for a qualified plan. The Proposed Rule is in response to the rule the Department adopted in 2020, Financial Factors in Selecting Plan Investments, 85 FR 72846 (Nov. 13, 2020) (the "2020 Rule"), which is interpreted generally to require plan fiduciaries to select investments and investment courses of action based solely on the consideration of "pecuniary factors." The 2020 Rule also contains a prohibition against adding or retaining any investment fund, product, or model portfolio as a qualified default investment alternative (QDIA) if the fund, product, or model portfolio reflects non-pecuniary objectives in its investment objectives or principal strategies.

LAM agrees with the Department's overall assessment of the 2020 Rule expressed in Section 3 of the preamble of the Proposed Rule—specifically, that the 2020 Rule (1) does not properly reflect the scope of fiduciaries' duties under ERISA to act prudently and solely in the interest of participants and beneficiaries when evaluating investments and (2) creates uncertainty surrounding whether a fiduciary under ERISA may consider any ESG and other important factors in making investment decisions. A number of Department bulletins and pronouncements pre-dating the 2020 Rule effectively guided plan fiduciaries that they could consider adding

ESG investment options to their plans pursuant to Section 404(a). See e.g., Interpretive Bulletin 2008-01, Interpretative Bulletin Relating to Investing in Economically Targeted Investments, 73 FR 61734 (Oct. 17, 2008); Interpretive Bulletin 2015-01, Interpretive Bulletin Relating to the Fiduciary Standard Under ERISA in Considering Economically Targeted Investments, 80 Fed. Reg. 65135 (Oct. 26, 2015); and Field Assistance Bulletin No. 2018-01 (April 23, 2018). The 2020 Rule changed the guidance and standards set forth in those precedents.

The Proposed Rule would add language in paragraph (b)(2)(ii)(C) of the current regulation to recognize explicitly that "consideration of the projected return of the portfolio relative to the funding objectives of the plan may often require an evaluation of the economic effects of climate change and other ESG factors on the particular investment or investment course of action."

This would allow plan fiduciaries to evaluate factors that many other investors already consider material. An analysis of over 16,000 global firms over the period of 2016 to 2020 conducted by the Lazard Climate Center found investors are actively pricing in risk from company emissions profiles. The study found that with all else being equal, changes in emissions profiles can have an impact on a company's market valuation. For example, a hypothetical 10 percent decrease in carbon dioxide emissions is associated with a 0.44 percent price-to-earnings appreciation. In addition, the Swiss Re Institute's April 2021 report *The Economics of Climate Change: No Action Not an Option*, states that "[t]he transition towards a low carbon economy . . . has repercussions for asset valuations. It is clear that climate transition risks can have a substantial impact on equity and credit valuations." Their analysis concludes that "under the current trajectory, global GDP could be 11–14 percent less by mid-century than in a world without climate change."

LAM's research recognizes that there will be economic winners and losers from the low carbon transition, and that economically material factors should not be ignored in investment analysis simply because they are of an environmental, social, or governance nature. The Proposed Rule properly grants fiduciaries the express permission to consider material ESG factors in their investment analysis, which we believe should result in promoting retirement income security and more secure retirement savings.

The Proposed Rule "confirms that a fiduciary may consider any factor material to the risk-return analysis, including climate change and other ESG factors" (emphasis added). It goes on to list numerous nonexclusive examples:

(i) Climate change-related factors, such as a corporation's exposure to the real and potential economic effects of climate change, including its exposure to the physical and transitional risks of climate change and the positive or negative effect of Government regulations and policies to mitigate climate change;

(ii) governance factors, such as those involving board composition, executive compensation, and transparency and accountability in corporate decision-making, as well as a corporation's avoidance of criminal liability and compliance with labor, employment, environmental, tax, and other applicable laws and regulations; and

(iii) workforce practices, including the corporation's progress on workforce diversity, inclusion, and other drivers of employee hiring, promotion, and retention; its investment in training to develop its workforce's skill; equal employment opportunity; and labor relations.

We believe that the examples given in the Proposed Rule, while necessarily incomplete, do serve the purpose of providing adequate guidance to plan fiduciaries. We also believe the Department's examples focus fiduciaries on economically material considerations.

At LAM, we have embedded ESG insights into our relevant investment research and portfolio construction functions. We have developed a proprietary ESG integration framework using (among other things) materiality mapping, which is being implemented across relevant investment platforms. As an active asset manager that has incorporated ESG considerations into its proprietary research, LAM is able to regularly provide our clients with examples of how such considerations have positively influenced investment outcomes. We have made these investments into our platform because we believe that investors—including plan fiduciaries—need to understand how ESG factors impact the financial productivity, operational risks, and valuations of the companies whose shares and bonds are in their portfolios.

Paragraph (c)(3) of the Proposed Rule amends the “tie breaker” standard in the 2020 Rule to allow fiduciaries to use broader discretion when comparing investment options. Under the proposal, a fiduciary evaluating two suitable investment options may select the ESG option over the non-ESG option where both would “equally serve the financial interests of the plan over the appropriate time horizon,” instead of limiting the use of the “tie-breaker” standard to situations in which both are “economically indistinguishable.” LAM agrees with this more comprehensive approach as it recognizes that fiduciaries should have the freedom to choose an investment for the purposes of diversification or to hedge against broad categories of risk, both of which can lead to better financial performance for a portfolio.

The Proposed Rule rescinds paragraph (d)(2)(ii) of the current regulation which prevents an investment option to serve as a qualified default investment alternative (QDIA) if it includes the use of non-pecuniary factors in its investment objectives even if the option is prudent from a risk and return perspective. LAM believes the 2020 Rule in this regard is contrary to goals of ERISA as it could potentially exclude financially prudent investment options on the simple basis that they consider economically material ESG factors. As previously stated, LAM believes that consideration of economically material factors should not be prohibited on the sole basis that they are of an environmental, social, or governance nature.

We believe that plan fiduciaries should include assessments of material ESG issues when evaluating retirement plan investments. The risks identified by an ESG-integrated assessment are often ultimately detrimental, and the opportunities identified can be quite additive, to the financial performance and value of assets in an investment portfolio. Importantly, the Proposed Rule greatly reduces the current uncertainty surrounding a fiduciary's consideration of material ESG factors. It restores trust in fiduciaries by allowing them to use their professional judgement to evaluate all material factors when selecting investment options for plan participants and beneficiaries.

In light of the foregoing, we recommend that the Department adopt and implement the Proposed Rule as written. We would be happy to provide the Department with additional information concerning our comments. Any requests should please be directed to our General Counsel, Mark Anderson.

Respectfully submitted,

NIKITA SINGHAL,
Co-Head Sustainable
Investment & ESG.

JENNIFER ANDERSON,
Co-Head Sustainable
Investment & ESG.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is just a small sample of the financial industry's support for the underlying rule. We should not overturn the rule with this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I oppose H.J. Res. 30, I encourage all Members to do the same, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 30, to stop the Biden administration from decimating the retirement savings of millions of Americans.

ESG funds will not give retirees the secure future they need. According to a former BlackRock senior executive, ESG funds underperformed the broader market compared to non-ESG funds over the last 5 years.

Retirees are already worried about the rising costs of goods and services, not whether a company is using plastic straws in its cafeteria.

Americans deserve to have a secure retirement. This means retirement plans need to focus solely on workers' financial interests. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 30, and I encourage my colleagues to vote against this measure.

H.J. Res. 30 would nullify a Department of Labor rule concerning the fiduciary duties with respect to employee benefit plans.

Under the rule issued on December 1, 2022, plan fiduciaries may consider climate change and other environmental, social, and governance (ESG) factors when they make investment decisions and when they exercise shareholder rights, including voting on shareholder resolutions and board nominations.

One of my greatest joys as a Member of Congress is the opportunity to work on behalf of the people of the United States of America, to ensure that every voice is heard, and every right is upheld.

In addition, the future of the American People relies heavily on thoughtful investments in key areas that include ESG as this is the backbone of our environment and the state of livelihoods of our growing communities.

Under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, fiduciaries of private pension plans must act in the interest of plan participants, including when making investment decisions.

If participants want to invest their employee benefits into environmental, social, and governance factors, the government should not be against it just because it goes against a particular party's interests.

The rule “Financial Factors in Selecting Plan Investments,” issued on November 13, 2020, required fiduciaries to make investment decisions based solely on “pecuniary factors.”

That rule included a “tiebreaker” standard, under which fiduciaries could consider other benefits when “alternative investment options are economically indistinguishable.”

The 2022 rule clarified how plan fiduciaries may consider climate change and other envi-

ronmental, social, or governance (commonly referred to as ESG) factors when making investment decisions.

Under the new regulation, fiduciaries may consider “the economic effects of climate change and other environmental, social, or governance factors,” but investment decisions “may not subordinate the interests of the participants and beneficiaries in their retirement income or financial benefits under the plan to other objectives and may not sacrifice investment return or take on additional investment risk.”

This bill establishes the disapproval of the final rule “Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights.”

The world is seeing more climate related disasters than ever before.

These disasters are greatly impacting the way that the public prepares their finances for potential strains.

In 2017 Hurricane Harvey ravaged many communities in my home state and devastated the livelihoods of many working-class Americans.

Many of my constituents experienced economic hardships that are still being felt today.

With an increase in natural disasters, we must protect the American public and provide them with opportunities to invest in their needs.

This point serves to acknowledge the importance we must put into our people and communities as things change and we continue to progress into the future.

Strategic and thoughtful investments in our people, environments, and livelihoods should be of utmost importance.

In essence, our future is dependent on how we invest in the now.

The American people want a future, and we can provide that by thoughtfully planning through our strategic investments in the American people of all backgrounds and the diverse environments in which we aim to thrive in for decades to come.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the House Resolution 166, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1645

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia) at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RELATING TO "PRUDENCE AND LOYALTY IN SELECTING PLAN INVESTMENTS AND EXERCISING SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 30) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights", on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 204, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—216

Aderholt	Curtis	Greene (GA)
Alford	D'Esposito	Griffith
Allen	Davidson	Grothman
Amodei	De La Cruz	Guest
Armstrong	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Arrington	Diaz-Balart	Hageman
Babin	Donalds	Harris
Bacon	Duarte	Harshbarger
Baird	Duncan	Hern
Balderson	Dunn (FL)	Higgins (LA)
Banks	Edwards	Hill
Barr	Ellzey	Hinson
Bean (FL)	Emmer	Houchin
Bentz	Estes	Hudson
Bergman	Ezell	Huizenga
Bice	Fallon	Hunt
Biggs	Feenstra	Issa
Bilirakis	Ferguson	Jackson (TX)
Bishop (NC)	Finstad	James
Boebert	Fischbach	Johnson (LA)
Bost	Fitzgerald	Johnson (OH)
Brecheen	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (SD)
Buchanan	Fleischmann	Jordan
Bucshon	Flood	Joyce (PA)
Burchett	Fox	Kean (NJ)
Burgess	Franklin, C.	Kelly (MS)
Burlison	Scott	Kelly (PA)
Calvert	Fry	Kiggans (VA)
Cammack	Fulcher	Kiley
Carey	Gaetz	Kim (CA)
Carl	Gallagher	LaHood
Carter (GA)	Garbarino	LaLota
Carter (TX)	Garcia, Mike	LaMalfa
Chavez-DeRemer	Gimenez	Lamborn
Ciscomani	Golden (ME)	Langworthy
Cline	Gonzales, Tony	Latta
Cloud	Good (VA)	LaTurner
Clyde	Gooden (TX)	Lawler
Cole	Gosar	Lee (FL)
Collins	Granger	Lesko
Comer	Graves (LA)	Letlow
Crane	Graves (MO)	Loudermilk
Crenshaw	Green (TN)	Lucas

Luetkemeyer	Obornolte	Stauber
Luna	Ogles	Steel
Luttrell	Owens	Stefanik
Mace	Palmer	Steil
Malliotakis	Pence	Stewart
Mann	Perry	Strong
Massie	Pfleger	Tenney
Mast	Posey	Thompson (PA)
McCaull	Reschenthaler	Tiffany
McClain	Rodgers (WA)	Timmons
McClintock	Rogers (AL)	Turner
McCormick	Rogers (KY)	Valadao
McHenry	Rose	Van Drew
Meuser	Rosendale	Van Deyne
Miller (IL)	Rouzer	Van Orden
Miller (OH)	Roy	Wagner
Miller (WV)	Rutherford	Walberg
Miller-Meeks	Salazar	Waltz
Mills	Santos	Weber (TX)
Molinaro	Scalise	Webster (FL)
Moolenaar	Schweikert	Wenstrup
Mooney	Scott, Austin	Westerman
Moore (AL)	Self	Williams (NY)
Moore (UT)	Sessions	Wilson (SC)
Moran	Simpson	Wittman
Murphy	Smith (MO)	Womack
Nehls	Smith (NE)	Yakym
Newhouse	Smith (NJ)	Zinke
Norman	Smucker	
Nunn (IA)	Spartz	

NAYS—204

Adams	Garcia, Robert	Norcross
Agullar	Goldman (NY)	Ocasio-Cortez
Allred	Gomez	Omar
Auchincloss	Gonzalez,	Pallone
Balint	Vicente	Panetta
Barragan	Gottheimer	Pappas
Beatty	Green, Al (TX)	Pascarella
Bera	Grijalva	Payne
Beyer	Harder (CA)	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Hayes	Peltola
Blumenauer	Higgins (NY)	Perez
Blunt Rochester	Himes	Peters
Bonamici	Horsford	Petterson
Bowman	Houlihan	Phillips
Boyle (PA)	Hoyer	Pingree
Brown	Hoyle (OR)	Pocan
Brownley	Huffman	Porter
Budzinski	Ivey	Pressley
Bush	Jackson (IL)	Quigley
Caraveo	Jackson (NC)	Ramirez
Carbajal	Jackson Lee	Raskin
Cardenas	Jacobs	Ross
Carson	Jayapal	Ruiz
Carter (LA)	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Ryan
Casas	Kamlager-Dove	Salinas
Case	Kaptur	Sanchez
Casten	Keating	Scanlon
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Cheriflus-	Khanna	Schiff
McCormick	Kildee	Schneider
Chu	Kilmer	Scholten
Cicilline	Kim (NJ)	Schrier
Clark (MA)	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Clarke (NY)	Kuster	Scott, David
Clyburn	Landsman	Sewell
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Sherrill
Correa	Lee (CA)	Slotkin
Costa	Lee (NV)	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Lee (PA)	Sorensen
Craig	Leger Fernandez	Soto
Crockett	Levin	Spanberger
Crow	Lieu	Stansbury
Cuellar	Lynch	Stanton
Davids (KS)	Magaziner	Stevens
Davis (NC)	Manning	Strickland
Dean (PA)	Matsui	Swalwell
DeGette	McBath	Sykes
DeLauro	McCollum	Takano
DeBene	McGarvey	Thanedar
Deluzio	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
DeSaulnier	Meeks	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Menendez	Titus
Doggett	Meng	Tlaib
Escobar	Mfume	Tokuda
Eshoo	Moore (WI)	Tonko
Espallat	Morelle	Torres (CA)
Evans	Moskowitz	Torres (NY)
Fletcher	Moulton	Trahan
Foster	Mrvan	Trone
Foushee	Mullin	Underwood
Frankel, Lois	Nadler	Vargas
Frost	Napolitano	Vasquez
Gallego	Neal	Veasey
Garamendi	Neguse	Velázquez
Garcia (TX)	Nickel	

Wasserman	Watson Coleman	Wilson (FL)
Schultz	Wexton	
Waters	Williams (GA)	

NOT VOTING—13

Buck	Garcia (IL)	Steube
Castro (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Wild
Cleaver	Kustoff	Williams (TX)
Crawford	Lofgren	
Davis (IL)	Sarbanes	

□ 1716

Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Messrs. SCOTT of Virginia, GARAMENDI, VEASEY, MOSKOWITZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Messrs. MRVAN and HUFFMAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I regrettably missed rollcall No. 124. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 124.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Speaker, due to testing positive for COVID-19 and following recommended isolation protocols, I was unable to vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall no. 122, "nay" on rollcall no. 123, and "nay" on rollcall no. 124.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE JAMES BROYHILL

(Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to gather with other Members of the North Carolina delegation on the floor this evening to acknowledge the passing of a great North Carolinian, the Honorable Jim Broyhill, who passed away at the age of 95 last week.

Today, there was a gathering in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, in celebration of his life, and my fellow Members and I have come to the floor this evening to ask the House to stand in a moment of silence in recognition of the service of this North Carolinian, who served 23 years in this House, served briefly in the United States Senate, and was substantially responsible for re-creating political competition and a revitalized Republican Party in the State of North Carolina.

On behalf of the North Carolina delegation, I ask the House do now observe a moment of silence in honor of Senator Jim Broyhill.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 179

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. Bost (to rank immediately after Mr. Bacon).

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Fleischmann (to rank immediately after Mr. Obernolte), Mr. Zinke (to rank immediately after Ms. Tenney).

Ms. STEFANIK (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REDUCE EXACERBATED INFLATION NEGATIVELY IMPACTING THE NATION ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 347.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 166 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 347.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1725

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 347) to require the Executive Office of the President to provide an inflation estimate with respect to Executive orders with a significant effect on the annual gross budget, and for other purposes, with Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of

the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. BUSH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 347, the Reduce Exacerbated Inflation Negatively Impacting the Nation Act, or REIN IN Act.

This legislation is timely and clearly needed. Sky-high inflation started sweeping across the Nation soon after the Biden administration came into power.

Pushing one big-spending policy after another, President Biden has continued to throw fuel on the inflationary fire. That fire is rapidly consuming the wages of our constituents. They have had to pay higher and higher prices for everything from eggs to electricity, all while inflation pushes their real wages further and further behind.

President Biden just does not seem to get it or admit it. At first, he and his administration ignored warnings his policies would spark inflation. Then, they tried to spin the tale that inflation was only temporary. Then, when it became obvious to everyone that was not the case, they attempted to claim that a monthly decrease in the rate of how fast inflation was rising meant inflation was actually falling, but anyone could see that made no sense.

It is long past time the President learned and admitted more about how his actions have led to this harmful inflation. That is why we need this bill.

The REIN IN Act ensures that costly actions the President decides to take solely under his own authority through executive orders will not go into effect until he is informed of and considers the potential inflationary effects.

How does the bill require that? Simple. It requires the President to receive and consider inflation estimates from the Office of Management and Budget and the Council of Economic Advisers for each executive order that is projected to cause an annual gross budgetary effect of at least \$1 billion.

The hope is the President, once he is informed of and understands the potential for inflationary harm from his own policy initiatives, will think twice about inflicting such harm. Here is hoping he does.

In addition, the bill requires regular reports to Congress on these new inflation estimates that are prepared for and considered by the President. That way, if the President ignores the dangers and marches ahead with an inflation-inducing policy, Congress will be better equipped to take timely action to rein in an irresponsible use of Presidential power.

That is our constitutional role in the legislative branch, which the REIN IN Act recognizes. This powerful legisla-

tive medicine will, I hope, lead the President to stop his inflationary onslaught on our economy.

Madam Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support this vital legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BUSH. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, St. Louis, House Democrats, and I rise today to strongly oppose H.R. 347, the Reduce Exacerbated Inflation Negatively Impacting the Nation Act.

While Democrats passed numerous laws last Congress that are successfully reducing inflation every month, House Republicans have come up with nothing more than a study in response. This is unbelievable.

The substance and process of this bill amount to nothing more than political theater to distract from and undermine the immense successes of congressional Democrats and the Biden administration.

□ 1730

If Republicans were serious about fighting inflation and cutting costs for regular, everyday people, they would have joined with Democrats to pass critical legislation like the Inflation Reduction Act to rebuild American manufacturing and lower the cost of prescription drugs, healthcare, energy, and other goods and services for the people of our country rather than pushing an extreme MAGA messaging bill that accomplishes nothing. Nothing. Not a thing.

The global spike in inflation has been caused by food and fuel disruptions resulting from the illegal and unprovoked Russian invasion of Ukraine, as well as auto part supply shortages connected to the COVID-19 pandemic. There is no evidence that government spending or executive orders by President Biden have increased inflation.

The President and congressional Democrats have taken steps to enact policies; not studies, not reports, but actual, tangible policies and dollars delivered to our communities to lower costs for regular, everyday people. Yet, we understand that still much more work remains.

For over 20 years, while I was a single mother of 2, I experienced countless times what it was like to see costs rise faster than my wages. I know what it is like to have to choose between paying the electric bill or paying rent.

I remember thinking to myself, who is it that is fighting for me and for other people in my situation?

Lawmakers in Congress can help alleviate that pain. Lawmakers in Congress can prioritize enacting policies to raise wages and lower costs, and that is what congressional Democrats have done.

For so many people in my community of St. Louis and around the country, skyrocketing rents and high utility costs are consistent barriers to

keeping families safe and fed, and that is a moral and policy failure.

We have seen how people's lives improved when the Federal Government stepped up to enact a moratorium on evictions or sent urgently needed stimulus checks to families or expanded the child tax credit or capped insulin at \$35 a month.

Those are the actions that saved lives. That is what we need, and we need more of that now. Yet, here we have a report.

However, what my House Republican colleagues have demonstrated this Congress and what they are demonstrating here today with this bill is that they are not serious about governing. They have circumvented regular order to bring this hollow bill to a vote on the House floor. Even as people continue to suffer the consequences of inflation and flawed responses that exacerbate unemployment, corporations, especially in the energy industry, have capitalized on this crisis to raise prices for everyday people and for families.

Last year, Exxon made \$56 billion in profits, using inflation as a cover to fleece regular, everyday people just trying to get to medical appointments or to school.

I oppose this bill because I am aware of what it is. It is a distraction from our work for our constituents. It is a waste of government resources, and it is a squandering of time that we should be using to rein in corporate greed and support those of our neighbors who need our help the most. I oppose this bill because it isn't a meaningful way to legislate. It is a political stunt.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK), the sponsor of the bill.

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Chair, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my REIN IN Act.

During the past 2 years of one party, far-left, radical, socialist Democrat rule in Washington led by President Joe Biden, inflation has skyrocketed to the highest level in my lifetime. You talk to any family, any small business, any farmer, any manufacturer, and they will say that the inflation that they are suffering from is crippling their businesses, crippling their family budgets.

It is a painful tax on every American and Bidenflation continues to be the number one concern I hear today across my district in upstate New York in the North Country.

In House Republicans' "Commitment to America," our new House majority, the people's House majority, promised to deliver and support policies to ensure our economy is strong.

In fact, one of the main reasons we have this Republican House majority is because the American people are smart. They know that the historic inflation, the highest rate of inflation in my lifetime, is a direct result of Joe

Biden's executive orders and the trillions and trillions of reckless and wasteful spending from single-party Democrat rule.

In fact, in Joe Biden's first year in office, he issued more executive orders than any President in my lifetime. This reckless, far-left agenda cost hardworking families more than \$1 trillion in taxpayer dollars and even more in the added cost of inflation. Whether it was canceling the Keystone XL pipeline on his first day in office to pushing his out-of-touch and costly Green New Deal regulations, Joe Biden has fueled this inflation crisis and caused this inflation crisis working with the previous radical, socialist Democrat majority.

By passing the REIN IN Act, House Republicans will demand transparency for the American people by revealing just how much Biden's executive orders are costing hardworking families and the painful impact that has on inflation.

What are the Democrats so afraid of?

This is about transparency for the American people, and it is long past time for Joe Biden to take into account this harmful impact of his failed, far-left agenda.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. STEFANIK. Today, House Republicans are laser-focused on fulfilling our commitment to America by reining in historic inflation, historic Bidenflation, on behalf of hardworking American families and small businesses, not just in my district, but across this great Nation.

Ms. BUSH. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ).

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Madam Chair, I thank the great Representative from St. Louis, Ms. BUSH, for yielding time.

Madam Chair, I rise today to speak against H.R. 347, the REIN IN Act, and I will start my remarks today by saying how ironic it is that Republicans spent the entire first week of this session entangled in a fight in order for them to get the votes to secure a Speaker of the House, and the whole crux of that entanglement was rules to maintain regular order in the House.

Just as we go back to Schoolhouse Rock, Republicans introduce a bill and it is supposed to go to committee, get a markup in that committee, a hearing in that committee, and a vote in that committee. If that bill can survive a committee vote, it comes right here to the floor of this House.

We spent a whole week tied up in the beginning of this term trying to reassert that order. And then, today, one of the first acts that we have from this Committee on Oversight and Reform is to subvert that because perhaps they knew that this would not survive their own committee. So it goes straight to the floor for a vote, subverting all of

those arguments that Republicans were making about restoring order to this House.

But let's get into the substance of this bill. Ironically, if they had gone through regular order, they may have caught that this bill does nothing to rein in inflation, in part, because in their haste to put it together, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle committed an incredibly basic drafting error that makes this bill completely unenforceable.

Even if we agreed on their ends, the haste and the rush to put this together and skip committee has created a drafting error that doesn't even make this bill enforceable. But even putting that error aside, my colleagues and I seem to have wildly different definitions of what actually is considered inflationary.

While Republicans have labeled virtually any Federal spending during the pandemic as inflationary—while railing against the child tax credit that helped babies continue to be fed and diapers on their bottoms, that helped families stitch things together, while they railed against the eviction moratoriums and the Paycheck Protection Act—Moody's Analytics found that the American Rescue Plan prevented this country from slipping into a double-digit recession.

Because of the American Rescue Plan and the actual Inflation Reduction Act that Democrats passed last year, our country's inflation rate is now lower than in the U.K., Canada, and 20 other European Union member states.

Yet Republicans have introduced legislation to repeal the Inflation Reduction Act, which would immediately raise the price of insulin along with other critical prescription drugs.

Tell me how that is fighting inflation when they are proposing to raise the cost of prescriptions.

Not only did Republicans vote to raise prices on prescription drugs, but they also voted against measures to drive down the price of gasoline last year.

Last year, Democrats presented a bill to penalize companies who were price gouging during the middle of Putin's war on Ukraine. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted against that, too.

So which one is it?

Republicans have controlled this body for almost 2 months and have not passed a single bill that would actually address inflation or cut costs for working families.

But you know what Democrats did?

In January, we capped the price of insulin at \$35 so that everyday working families can actually get a little bit more ahead. And we have a lot more to go.

But we don't even see a carefulness and a thoughtfulness from the other side of the aisle to even draft the language in this bill properly. It is not even ready for a vote, so why should we.

Madam Chair, for that reason, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this so-called REIN IN Act.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, I rise in favor of H.R. 347, the REIN IN Act.

I do think that it is very rich that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are talking about regular order all of a sudden. My first 2 years in Congress there was no such thing as regular order. In fact, I served on the Budget Committee and they passed two budget reconciliations on the House floor without it going through committee: completely bypassed committee.

First one was \$1.9 trillion. The next one, \$700 billion. Really all it was, was the Green New Deal: just real quick, hurry up, get it to the floor. We have to spend trillions and trillions of dollars and hurt as many Americans as possible in the 2 years that we have left in power.

With this REIN IN Act, this bill will hold Joe Biden accountable for this reckless spending that he has approved by my Democrat colleagues, who hastily sent all of these bills to him, rushing him to spend trillions and trillions of American taxpayer dollars.

His administration will now be required to publish the inflationary impact of executive orders before enacting them.

Madam Chair, my constituents are struggling to deal with the disastrous effects of Bidenflation. Under 2 years of a one-party rule, Joe Biden and NANCY PELOSI unleashed a record inflation crisis on the American people that has decimated their bank and retirement accounts, increased gas prices to record levels, raised utility bills, drove up grocery costs, and made it harder to live for the people in my district, Colorado's Third District, and all throughout this great country.

The primary root cause of this record-breaking inflation was trillions of dollars of wasteful Federal spending.

In Joe Biden's first year in office alone, he issued more executive orders than any other President in my lifetime, costing taxpayers more than \$1 trillion.

The American people said loud and clear last November that enough is enough. They have empowered this new majority to demand transparency by revealing just how much Biden's executive orders are costing American families and small businesses.

Madam Chair, I thank my colleague and chairwoman of the Republican Conference, ELISE STEFANIK, for her work to hold Joe Biden and his administration accountable.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the underlying bill.

□ 1745

Ms. BUSH. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mary-

land (Mr. RASKIN), the ranking member of the Oversight Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee for her leadership on refuting this legislation.

After 2 years of rooting for economic failure and blaming President Biden for everything; for post-COVID global inflation, for the instability caused by supply chain breakdowns, and the phenomenal failure of Donald Trump's mismanagement of the coronavirus pandemic, after all that, after all the whining and crying about inflation, Republicans finally have the chance to take center stage, right now, with their proposed solution to the problem of inflation.

The world has been waiting with bated breath. Would it be what Richard Nixon did, wage and price controls? Would it be what Herbert Hoover, that Republican did, total laissez-faire, whatever happens, happens?

Well, the long wait is over. The GOP has now debuted their big plan for dealing with inflation in America with H.R. 347, something called the REIN IN Act, which stands for the Reduce Exacerbated Inflation Negatively Impacting the Nation Act.

It is a bill for a mandatory reporting requirement related to executive orders that might apply to two or three executive orders a year.

You got that right: A reporting requirement related to a handful of executive orders every year is the GOP's response to inflation after barnstorming the entire country, claiming that they had some kind of solution.

Now, you might think it is the most brilliant thing since the invention of Social Security, which they opposed, or Medicare, which they opposed, or you might think it is the dumbest thing since Donald Trump's last trillion-dollar corporate tax giveaway.

But either way, it will have zero effect on inflation or deflation in the United States of America. Nothing. It is not going to have any effect at all.

Now, our friends in the GOP are interested in this session of Congress in tortured, inscrutable, incomprehensible acronyms.

So they can have the REIN IN Act, which they seem very connected to, but I want to suggest a better title that will still conform to their acronym. Let's call it the running on empty initiative based on no ideas none act. How about that?

The legislation was hatched without any hearing, and it shows. It has no legislative meaning and no potential economic consequences.

Even as reporting bills go, it is pathetically weak, as it doesn't even require publication of the report. They came up with a reporting requirement that didn't even require the report to be published.

Look, executive orders are not the cause of inflation, and there is no economic research suggesting they are.

The most conservative economists in the world will tell you that inflation is

a complex, global phenomenon connected to prices, supply chains, supply and demand curves, and unemployment rate.

Since 2020, inflation has risen worldwide, exacerbated by supply chain delays caused by the pandemic and then Vladimir Putin's filthy war of aggression in Ukraine, which some of our friends over there support.

President Biden has created something like an economic miracle out of the chaos handed to him by Donald Trump.

After signing his massive tax giveaway, Trump's failed State dysfunctional response to COVID plunged America into its most severe economic contraction since 1946. Someone dispute that.

The unemployment rate rose to 14.8 percent under Donald Trump, the highest on record since the Bureau of Labor Statistics began collecting data in 1948.

In 2021, Biden and the Democrats got to work. We passed the American Rescue Plan, which fueled a strong, equitable, economic recovery with historic reductions in unemployment, in poverty, in economic hardship.

Real GDP increased by 5.7 percent. The unemployment rate decreased to 4 percent, surpassing all forecasts. Wages increased by 5 percent with the highest increases going to lower economic income earners.

So Democratic policies have allowed the U.S. to absorb the shock of rising inflation engulfing the globe since 2020.

That is serious economic policy, what President Biden and the Democrats are engaged in, and they have a silly little symbolic messaging bill for a couple of notations they didn't even want to publish originally within the process of offering executive orders.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. BUSH. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, we have created 12 million new jobs in America. How many million jobs do they want to erase over there in their desperate, sudden pursuit of inflation?

They raised the debt limit three times under Donald Trump. Now they talk about the debt limit all the time. They raised it three times, and they contributed under Donald Trump 25 percent of all the debt in the United States from George Washington to Joe Biden—25 percent of the debt under one President, Donald Trump.

They did that, and now they dare come talk to us about inflation, and the bill that they advance is one to have some people pass some more paperwork around.

Come on. Give me a break. Give us something better than the running on empty initiative with no new ideas at all.

We recommend a “no” vote. What real economic action requires is precisely what President Biden is already doing.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Ms. BUSH. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, over the past 2 years, through the Inflation Reduction Act, the American Rescue Plan, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, and other successes, Democrats and President Biden have made historic investments in public transit, renewable energy, healthcare, and economic stability.

We have created jobs. We have advanced justice. We have advanced equity. We have reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and we have slowed down inflation.

We put hundreds of dollars in people's pockets. We capped the price of insulin. We invested in people.

As a result, when adjusted for inflation, wages have risen for so many families over the last 7 months, and unemployment remains at its lowest level since 1969.

However, we need to do so much more. Many of our neighbors, particularly those with the greatest need, are suffering from the consequences of high costs across the board.

I am glad House Democrats controlled the House during the pandemic. This bill makes a mockery of people living in poverty who need meaningful relief.

The Republicans' big idea, the big plan that we have been told about and waiting on is to write a flawed bill that mandates—guess what—more paperwork. Give me a break, as my ranking member just said.

I know what it is like to be at risk of eviction. I know what it is like to be hungry. I know what it is like to be cold, so cold that you don't know if you will survive the nights.

Never one time when I was living out of my car with my two babies did I ask for a report from Congress for help. I needed diapers. I needed food. You can't eat a report.

If this bill was to move forward, no one will be saying, I am so glad I used this report to pay the rent. Let me take shelter with this report because Congress did their job.

Let's take real care, real actual care of the people. I oppose this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This legislation asks every Member to answer two simple questions.

First, do you want the President to know what the inflationary dangers are before he takes executive actions?

Second, when the President knows about the economic dangers of a policy and inflicts them on our constituents anyway, do you want to be better informed so that Congress can take the necessary action to rein in the executive branch?

The answers to both of those questions ought to be yes. This bill makes sure both the President and the Con-

gress have the necessary information so we can discharge our duties more efficiently and responsibly.

Our constituents back home, who have been suffering from the inflationary effects of Washington's poorly thought-out policies, deserve nothing less.

I urge my colleagues to support this much-needed bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The bill is considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 347

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Reduce Exacerbated Inflation Negatively Impacting the Nation Act".

SEC. 2. EXECUTIVE ORDER MANDATED INFLATION ACCOUNTABILITY AND REFORM.

(a) MANDATORY INFLATION FORECASTING.—For any major Executive order, the President, acting through the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Chair of the Council of Economic Advisers, shall prepare and consider a statement estimating the inflationary effects of the Executive order, including whether the Executive order is determined to have no significant impact on inflation, is determined to have quantifiable inflationary impact on the consumer price index, or is determined likely to have a significant impact on inflation but the amount cannot be determined at the time the estimate is prepared.

(b) AGENCY ASSISTANCE.—The head of each agency shall provide to the President, acting through the Director and the Chair, such information and assistance as the President, acting through the Director and the Chair, may reasonably request to assist the President, acting through the Director and the Chair, in carrying out this section.

(c) REPORTING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, the President, acting through the Director and the Chair, shall submit to the Committees on the Budget of the Senate and House of Representatives a report containing each statement prepared and considered under subsection (a) during the year.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGENCY.—The term "agency" has the meaning given such term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) MAJOR EXECUTIVE ORDER.—The term "major Executive order" means any Executive order that would be projected (in a conventional cost estimate) to cause an annual gross budgetary effect of at least \$1,000,000,000, but does not include any such measure that—

(A) provides for emergency assistance or relief at the request of any State or local government or any official of a State or local government; or

(B) is necessary for the national security or the ratification or implementation of international treaty obligations.

(3) STATE.—The term "State" means each State of the United States, the District of Columbia, each commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States, and each federally recognized Indian Tribe.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those

printed in House report 118-4. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BOST

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 118-4.

Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after the period insert the following: "To the greatest extent practicable, any estimate of the inflationary impact of any major Executive order under this section shall take into account the spending patterns of military personnel and of residents of non-metropolitan areas, including rural areas and farm households."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 166, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Bost) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Consumer Price Index is defined as "the average change over time in the prices paid by urban customers."

Now, let me say that again: Urban customers. What about the 46 million Americans who live in rural areas or the 2.6 million workers that are working on a farm or the 1.3 million in the military? They are crushed by inflation, as well.

Illinois' 12th District is one of the largest agricultural districts in the region. It is also home of Scott Air Force Base. But all too often, these hard-working, God-fearing patriots are ignored by the D.C. swamp.

The President can't ignore their needs simply because they don't live in liberal cities like New York, L.A., and Chicago, so my amendment is simple.

Since the spending patterns of military personnel, individuals in rural areas, and farm households are not included in the CPI, they must be taken into account separately in this report.

These are the individuals who produce the food on our kitchen tables, the ones who raise their right hand and swear to defend our Nation. They deserve to be represented, to be heard. My amendment ensures that they are.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, actually, I have a question because it strikes me

as a very sincerely and decently motivated amendment to a flawed bill.

But is there a reason to think that any of the current economic analyses of inflation and the current indicators that we use don't take into account the various factors that the gentleman specifies?

I yield to the gentleman for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, yes, because the definition itself describes that it is only urban and, therefore, not considering the issues, because I can guarantee you that the price and the situation that occurs in people's lives and the cost of living is completely different from one area to the other.

We are just saying that this should be taken into consideration, as well.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, reclaiming my time.

That makes great sense to me, and I am tempted to support the amendment. If the gentleman is correct, that points to a larger problem.

Is the gentleman telling us that the inflation rate today that is published by our government does not incorporate spending patterns in rural areas, for example?

□ 1800

Mr. BOST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. BOST. It is my understanding, by the definition, that would be the case, that everyone should be considered. By this definition, it is not everyone that is considered, only urban.

Mr. RASKIN. I am sorry. By which definition?

Mr. BOST. By the definition that the Consumer Price Index is defined as the average change, over time, in prices paid by urban customers, not by all customers, which would include the people I was talking about, urban only.

Mr. RASKIN. Reclaiming my time, I don't know what the reason for that is, and thank you for educating me. I wasn't aware of it.

I assume they are saying the inflation rate is higher in urban areas than it is in rural areas, which is, presumably, why they peg it to that. That might bring the inflation rate down.

Would the gentleman just give me a sense of how taking it into account might affect what is today the general inflation rate? Let's assume it is inflated because it is focused on the urban areas where the cost of living is higher. Would it reduce the overall inflation rate?

Mr. BOST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. BOST. Let me explain it this way. The answer is, I don't know, nor do you, nor does anyone because we only use the urban. Therefore, the best thing we could do is include all.

Mr. RASKIN. Reclaiming my time, this very constructive colloquy, I

think, underscores the importance of actually having hearings in Congress. This is legislation that sprung out of someone's head somewhere and then appeared on the House floor without actually having a hearing where we could examine it.

The gentleman raises a profound point that might lead us to question inflation statistics generally. I just don't know. At this point, we are all guessing because we haven't had a hearing, and we don't know the facts of it.

Unfortunately, we are going to be sending people, including me, to the floor to vote on this amendment without really having any information about the background.

Obviously, we want to make sure that military personnel, farm households, and residents of rural areas are included, forcefully, if they are excluded now, even if that means bringing the inflation rate down, something I imagine President Biden would quite enjoy.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my colleague's amendment, which makes an important improvement to the bill.

The sky-high inflation America is experiencing under the Biden administration hits hard military families, rural areas, and farm households. Too often, these vital groups of our constituents get short shrift in Washington's policy considerations.

My friend's amendment makes sure that will not happen when it comes to the inflation impact assessments this bill requires.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, I appreciate the input from everybody involved, and I ask for positive consideration.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COMER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 118-4.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 25, after "House of Representatives", insert "the Committee on Homeland

Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Oversight and Accountability of the House of Representatives".

Page 3, line 10, after "budgetary", insert "or economic".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 166, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment is a manager's amendment to enhance in two ways this already very good bill.

First, my amendment expands the bill's coverage. Instead of just covering executive orders with more than \$1 billion in annual effect on the Federal budget, it would also cover executive orders with overall economic impact on our Nation's economy of \$1 billion or more.

We should have inflation-impact assessments for executive orders with such significant economic effects. One such order, for example, would surely be Executive Order No. 13992, by which President Biden revoked President Trump's major regulatory reform orders.

As we all know, President Trump's orders contributed massively to the booming economy America had during the last administration. Beyond doubt, their revocation inflicted more than \$1 billion of annual harm on the economy. Their repeal also makes it harder for American companies to produce a host of goods and services. That will raise inflation by making those goods and services scarcer and more costly.

Other good examples are Executive Orders Nos. 13990 and 14008. These are whole-of-government executive orders by President Biden on climate policy. These orders canceled the Keystone pipeline and launched a host of high-cost regulatory actions, particularly affecting energy.

Those executive orders surely contributed to the sky-high energy inflation Americans have experienced under President Biden.

The second way my amendment improves the bill is by requiring the White House's inflation-impact assessments to be reported not just to the House and Senate Budget Committees but also to the House Oversight and Accountability Committee and the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee. These committees of cross-cutting jurisdiction should receive these annual reports.

Madam Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, the first thing I want to note about this amendment is that it now expands the definition of a major executive order to include those projected to cause an annual gross budgetary or economic effect of at least \$1 billion, which includes those orders that would have a positive economic effect of \$1 billion or more, thereby just adding a lot more paperwork, a lot more unnecessary bureaucratic entanglement.

The distinguished chair of the Oversight and Accountability Committee, I think, mentioned in passing the Biden administration's attempt to roll back some of the radical deregulatory program of the Trump administration, which undermined regulations favoring automobile safety, train safety, water safety, land safety.

Again, we have what appears to be another clever talking point by the GOP, and the whole country is now up in arms over what took place in East Palestine, Ohio. We see precisely what the human effects and consequences are of their radical, pro-corporate deregulatory agenda, dismantling the rules and regulations that protect public safety and public welfare.

That is really what is going on over there. It is not about having a couple of little analyses stuck onto an executive order every 4, 5, or 6 months. We know exactly what the real economic program is.

This bill is a camouflage, just like this amendment is, and I urge the body to oppose it.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. BOEBERT

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 118-4.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 24, after "shall", insert the following: "publish on the public website of the Office of Management and Budget and"

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 166, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, I rise in favor of Amendment No. 3, which will require inflation-impact assessments to be published on the Office of Management and Budget's website, not just reported to Congress.

This simple, straightforward amendment will ensure that the American people, who bear the brunt of inflation's impacts, will be better informed of the President's inflation-inducing actions.

Without my amendment, the real-life consequences of Joe Biden's spending spree in the White House will not be seen by those impacted most. This will provide transparency for the administration to answer to the American people.

Thanks to Joe Biden's reckless spending agenda, America will spend \$10 trillion more over the next 10 years than we were estimated to spend. While the Federal Government continues to spend trillions of dollars it doesn't have, inflation has hit a 40-year high and our Nation is now mired in a recession.

Instead of addressing these major economic concerns head-on, the Democratic solution to inflation is to keep on spending.

The GOP majority has been empowered to hold the Biden administration accountable and demand transparency by revealing just how much Biden's executive orders are costing American families and small businesses.

This excessive spending has real consequences. American families will pay an \$8,581 inflation tax over the next year.

Currently, 20 million Americans cannot pay their electric bill. We have seen a 4.3 percent decline in real wages since Biden took office. Americans have lost more than \$2 trillion in retirement savings. Gas is nearly \$4 a gallon again.

Americans are paying more for everything because of leftwing extremist policies.

House Republicans are working to reduce inflation by fundamentally changing the way we vote on appropriations bills and putting an end to reckless spending omnibus packages passed on Christmas Eve, without any time to actually read the bills, multi-thousand-page bills spending trillions of dollars, about 24 hours or less to read it.

We are working to cut wasteful spending, get to the bottom of fraudulent payments made by the Federal Government, support American energy production, and oppose tax increases proposed by the Democrats. Economic strength and job growth result from policies that unshackle job creators, allow American ingenuity, and provide certainty.

Madam Chair, I again thank my colleague, the chairwoman of the Republican Conference, ELISE STEFANIK, for her leadership on this issue.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and vote in favor of the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I want to just clear up a couple of things.

First, I heard the very distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado mention job creators. I assume she was responding to President Biden since 12 million

new jobs have been created under President Biden, whereas millions of jobs were lost under the prior President, who may be a favorite of the gentlewoman's.

I also wanted to make just a brief semantic point because the gentlewoman was making a grammatical error that I heard some of her colleagues make before. I believe she referred to a "Democrat solution." I heard another Member talk about a "Democrat Member" and a "Democrat plan."

I just wanted to educate our distinguished colleagues that "Democrat" is the noun. When you use it as an adjective, you say the "Democratic Member," or the "Democratic solution," or the "Democratic plan."

I assume it is a good faith grammatical error the first few times, but after people are corrected several times and they continue to say it, it seems like it is an act of incivility, as if every time we mentioned the other party it just came out with a kind of political speech impediment like, "Oh, the banana Republican Party," as if we were to say that every time we mentioned the "banana Republican Member," or the "banana Republican plan," or the "banana Republican Conference," but we wouldn't do that.

□ 1815

So out of pure political courtesy, when it is an adjective, refer to the "Democratic Congresswoman" or the "Democratic Member."

Having said that, I would like to say that I favor the Boebert amendment. I think it is really the Raskin amendment because none of them apparently caught the fact that their reporting requirement wasn't to be published until I told them. I actually read the bill, and I said there is no publication of it. So this amendment follows through on the fact that I pointed out to them that their bill didn't even call for publication of the inflation information which they thought was so essential.

Madam Chair, I am afraid I am going to have to support the Boebert amendment, because I think I am the genesis of it.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, I do want to take a few seconds to respond. That was great. We are addressed as MAGA extremists, extreme MAGA Republicans. I will just make a clarification point. It is ultra MAGA. That is what we prefer.

But I will say to the ranking member, I am very happy that they have moved on from pronouns to adjectives. When they start acting democratic, I will be sure to call them the Democratic Party.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

The REIN IN Act already ensures both the President and Congress receive the inflation impact assessment

the bill requires. My colleague's amendment guarantees another vital recipient gets these assessments, as well: that recipient is the American people, who are bearing the brunt of Bidenflation.

Once the White House assessments are posted on the Office of Management and Budget's website plain as day, as my friend's amendment requires, the American people will be able to know and judge better for themselves how the President is impacting their daily lives.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the amendment.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CLOUD

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 118-4.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 14, insert after the period the following: "Any statement prepared under this subsection shall incorporate the inflationary impact of the debt servicing costs associated with the applicable major Executive order."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 166, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The intent of the REIN IN Act is to ensure that the executive branch is taking into account inflation in our country before they issue new regulations.

Our country has seen rising inflation over the last 2 years, and inflation is affecting all of us. It is affecting our families, especially those with lower incomes who don't have as much of a cushion to deal with what we are seeing as they face increasing costs, especially in gas and in groceries.

But as we consider the cost of inflation, we should also include the cost of debt servicing in what we are doing. Too often, we, as a government, don't do the same thing that we expect our families to do. When someone goes to purchase a car, for example, or a house, they have to include the cost of interest that they are going to pay on those kinds of things. We regularly ignore

that as if it wasn't an important part of what we spend when, in fact, it is about \$600 billion of spending annually.

This is why I offered my amendment to the REIN IN Act. My amendment would amend the bill to direct the Office of Management and Budget and the Council of Economic Advisers to incorporate the inflationary impact of debt servicing costs into the reports that they create.

Rising interest rates have the same effect on costs of spending on the national result, as well. We see rising interest rates have the same meaning for our country as the families that we encounter. But in order to accurately account for what we are spending, we cannot ignore the cost of debt servicing or the real cost that will be accrued with new spending.

The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget released a report today that estimated net interest will total \$10.5 trillion over the next decade. As lawmakers, we have a duty to be honest about the effects of our actions, and this amendment will keep us honest about the true effects of our spending.

Madam Chair, I encourage support of my amendment and the underlying legislation as well, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I would ask if the gentleman would be willing to yield for a couple of questions?

Again, there was no hearing in committee, so I don't understand this. This might be a great idea, but I would like to figure it out.

It requires that any inflationary estimates prepared incorporate the inflationary impact of debt servicing costs, which seems perfectly logical to me.

But is there a reason to think that the current inflation rate, as defined by the U.S. Government, does not incorporate the inflationary impact of debt servicing costs?

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Chair, yes, it has been regular practice with CBO. I have been working to get this done for the CBO as well since I got here in Congress.

It is the common practice among all of the entities that we look to for wisdom and advice and guidance on budgeting and spending, that the cost of debt servicing is not counted into their projections.

Mr. RASKIN. So that is true across the board in terms of all of the economic indicators that we read about, whether it is the OMB or the—

Mr. CLOUD. The information that we get to take into account, like when we are evaluating a bill and what we think the 10-year projected cost is, yes, typically it does not include the debt servicing cost.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I reclaim my time and thank the gentleman for his kind answers.

This really is why we have hearings in Congress, because it feels like we are just posting a lot of graffiti on a wall here.

I don't know how the inflation rate is calculated. I don't know whether the import of this amendment would be to double count debt servicing costs because I don't know which government agencies actually incorporate debt servicing costs and which don't.

One thing I do know is that if the gentleman has the greatest amendment of the year, it is still basically irrelevant because it does nothing. In other words, it is not going to do anything to bring down anybody's debt servicing costs, which I agree are huge, unlike, for example, what the Biden administration has done in terms of student debt by acting dramatically to bring it down—even though there are people from across the aisle who are in court today, I believe, trying to get that thrown out and trying to bring everybody's student loan debt back up—that is real economic action.

In any event, what this is about is pure symbolism. In other words, they are asking for a reporting bill that will only apply if there is a \$1 billion plus impact, and the good gentleman comes forward to say: Make sure, Mr. President, when you are doing your calculations, that you include debt servicing costs.

I don't know. You could take it or leave it. It doesn't do anything for people who are staggering under debt. The way that the Biden administration is trying to act, for example, is to deal with the problem of student debt or the way that we have acted to try to help people who are suffering under mortgage debt, that is real economic action.

I am just going to have to consider it carefully, given the information we have. But I will end with a plea for the good chairman of the Oversight Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky: We have to have hearings on these bills, so we know what we are talking about, because I feel like we are dancing in the dark here.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I once again point out that we spend approximately \$600 billion a year in interest payments, yet we do not count the cost of what the debt servicing will cost in anything we do.

Now, that is, in short order, expected to eclipse our military spending, which is our number one constitutional priority for our Federal spending. Whatever we want to do up here, if we do not begin to count the real cost of what we are doing, we will be off. Right now, we are having to deal with a debt ceiling issue, because the previous Congress decided to spend without considering the cost of what it was going to take and to push us toward the limit.

We are cognizant of the fact that we are spending. We are going to monitor our spending in a way that we leave a

better country for our kids and our grandkids, and this is part of making sure that we are actually counting the real cost of what we are doing as we take each step.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER), the distinguished chair of the Oversight Committee.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

Often when inflation is considered, people fail to consider one of its important effects. That effect is on how much more it costs taxpayers to pay interest on our Federal debt. Those interest payments are high, and they spike higher when interest rates rise.

The Congressional Budget Office estimated that the Federal Government would pay \$400 billion in interest on the Federal debt during fiscal year 2022. The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget projected at the time that for every 1 percent increase in interest rates, those annual payments would rise by \$38 billion. Remember, that was for fiscal year 2022, when the Federal debt and interest rates were lower than they are now.

My colleague's amendment makes sure the impact on the Federal debt service costs will not be overlooked in the inflation impact assessments the bill requires.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I just repeat my puzzlement from before.

Perhaps if Mr. CLOUD would yield for another question.

What is the inflationary impact of debt servicing costs? Have there been any economic studies on that?

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman for a colloquy.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Chair, what we are trying to do is make sure that the debt servicing cost is included into these studies we are getting.

I have a bill, for example, to eventually do it with the Congressional Budget Office. We would like to see that, as well. This would make sure that we are getting this done in the REIN IN Act with the OMB and the Council of Economic Advisers.

It is common sense to me. This should be bipartisan. We should really be counting the costs of what we are actually spending. This isn't really meant to be a controversial bill, except for those who don't really want to know what we are actually spending.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I reclaim my time.

I think the gentleman raises a very interesting point. I would love to know the answer as to whether or not it is actually incorporated today in what the inflationary or deflationary effects are of debt servicing costs. Obviously, this bill and this amendment would not have any impact on what those debt servicing costs are, but I don't see much of a problem of adding this language to the hortatory nature of the legislation.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just add, it may not change what we are doing, but it would change the knowledge of what we are doing here in Congress. The fact that we continue to spend money without even knowing how much money we are spending, I think, is a problem and certainly not the due diligence that we should have as Members of Congress, being diligent with the public trust that we have been given.

So having the real cost estimates before us is going to be very valuable as we go forward to understand exactly what we are doing as we begin to evaluate legislation and for the administration when they are dealing with regulations they are proposing.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I will just end on this one with this thought.

The majority comes forward with a plan to say we want to know an estimated inflationary impact of an executive order, and then we have a series of Christmas tree amendments saying, make sure you include the cost to rural areas; make sure you include the cost of debt servicing. I would like to know the overall costs.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1830

The CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 5 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 118-4.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 10, strike "inflation," and insert "inflation or".

Page 2, beginning on line 11, strike the comma and all that follows through "prepared" on line 14.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 166, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, for those of us who have had the privilege of serving in the United States Congress for a period of time, going through any number of Speakers and majorities, what we are doing this evening in the midst of the needs of the American people is *deja vu*.

Let me say that the Congressional Review Act process, which we debated

just a few hours ago, would have added a 60-day review period on crucial, life-saving executive orders that would have been necessary or have been necessary to save lives and to improve the quality of life of the American people—in this instance, rulemaking.

It is obstructionist. It was passed, the Congressional Review Act—obstruction—some 60-day review period, adding a Senate vote, a House vote, a veto, and coming back again when American lives are in jeopardy for healthcare, for the environment, for labor laws, any number of things, for criminal justice reform, any number of rules that would create a better pathway for Americans.

Now, we come with the REIN IN Act. I am positive that we did the REIN IN Act some years ago. It sounds very familiar. This one deals with allegedly providing some pathway for dealing effectively with inflation.

I would hope my colleagues would be as interested in raising the debt ceiling, which will stop the bleeding of the American people and busting their wallets open because we have refused to pay our bills.

This seems to ignore the work that President Biden has done to cut everyday costs for working families, bring global supply chains back in, alleviating debt for students and veterans, and fighting climate change.

This part of their larger plan to cut Medicare, Social Security, and other crucial programs are in this bill.

Eliminating the language that we did with my amendment further helps to ensure that improper and ambiguous congressional interference in executive orders as sought through this legislation is appropriately curtailed.

The executive orders that are well vetted by the President of the United States that have helped populations that have been in trouble, that have brought about a reckoning of police reform, these executive orders would not be interfered with under the pretense of trying to suggest an inflationary impact.

Why not applaud the work that President Biden has done, as I said, with alleviating the debt of students and veterans, of which there are those now fighting this in the Supreme Court, the work he has done on climate change, and the work we have all done—Democrats and the President—to preserve Medicare, Social Security, and other critical programs?

I ask my colleagues to support Jackson Lee amendment No. 6 to stop the interference that has no benefit and impact on any inflationary uptick. What we need to do is work together to provide a budget, to be able to overview the budget, and to be able to come together to raise the debt ceiling to pay America's bills.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to support amendment No. 6, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, the amendment strikes the bill's requirement for an inflation impact assessment when an executive order will have a significant impact on inflation, but the impact cannot yet be precisely quantified.

That is exactly the wrong approach to take. If the White House can determine an executive order will indeed have a significant impact on inflation, that is what is important. The President should know about that before he acts.

It would be unwise and dangerous to happily let the President proceed in the dark about an order's inflationary impacts just because they cannot be calculated with perfect precision.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, this is *deja vu*. I know the intent of this legislation, the Reduce Exacerbated Inflation Negatively Impacting the Nation Act.

What I would say is my amendment clearly wants to take away destructive interference in the work that the executive has to do through vetting their executive orders by not insisting on extra baggage that would not in any way provide any relief to inflation.

What will provide relief to inflation would be to ensure that the debt of students is reduced, that veterans are protected, that Medicare and Social Security are protected, and that the debt ceiling is raised.

My amendment, by eliminating the language, further helps to ensure that improper and ambiguous congressional interference with executive orders, as sought through this legislation, is appropriately curtailed because the more you delay constructive executive orders to help the American people, the more you undermine the relief of the American people and help to bring down inflation.

Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 347, the Reduce Exacerbated Inflation Negatively Impacting the Nation or REIN In Act, an unnecessary, ambiguous and improper reporting bill that undermines the important steps President Biden has taken to cut everyday costs for working families.

H.R. 347 would require the Administration to publish the inflationary impact of executive orders that are projected to have an annual budgetary effect of at least \$1 billion.

While I stand in strong opposition to this measure, I have offered five amendments, four of which were made in order, to H.R. 347 in order to help address the some of ambiguity and unnecessary oversight of presidential executive orders this bill unfortunately puts forth.

Jackson Lee Amendment #5 restricts the bill to only cover Executive Orders as listed in Sec. 2 (d)(2)(A) (emergency assistance) and (B) (national security or treaties).

The Jackson Lee Amendment #5 would change the legislation to make only those executive orders that qualify as emergency assistance and national security or treaties to go through mandatory inflation forecasting, instead of requiring that all executive orders outside of the scope of emergency assistance or national security or treaties go through mandatory inflation forecasts.

Jackson Lee Amendment #6 inserts into Sec. 2 (a) line 10 "or" after "inflation" and Strikes Sec. (a) lines 11–14, to clarify and make consistent with economic policy on inflationary impacts and effects.

Jackson Lee Amendment #6 would eliminate some of the ambiguous and extraneous language in this bill.

Jackson Lee Amendment #7 adds at the end of section 2(d) the definition to "significant impact" in Sec. 2 (a), which states as follows: "The term 'significant impact on inflation' means an Executive order was estimated to increase or decrease Consumer Price Index inflation by at least 1% percentage point over the course of a year."

Jackson Lee Amendment #7 would define significant impact in regard to the increase or decrease of the Consumer Price Index.

It is important that Significant Impact to the Consumer Price Index of inflation is specified to eliminate ambiguity in the application of the term "significant".

In keeping in line with nationally recognized standards for what is deemed to be "significant" in the context of inflation, many economists agree that an increase or decrease in the Consumer Price Index inflation by at least 1% percentage point over the course of a year is considered to be a significant impact on the Consumer Price Index over a year.

Jackson Lee Amendment #8 adds at the end of section 2(d), (4) "The term 'quantifiable inflationary impact' means an Executive order was estimated to increase or decrease Consumer Price Index inflation by at least 1% percentage point over the course of a year."

The Jackson Lee Amendment #8 would specify the meaning and application of what quantifiable inflationary impact is to eliminate ambiguity and uncertainty in its contextual use for the purpose of this legislation.

And so again, keeping in line with nationally recognized standards, many economists agree that a "quantifiable inflationary impact" is deemed to occur when there is an increase or decrease in the Consumer Price Index inflation by at least 1% percentage point over the course of a year.

While H.R. 347 is a clear overreach and would impose improper and onerous restrictions upon the Executive Branch, the Jackson Lee Amendments will be offered to this body as mere attempted to help ensure that the inappropriate limitations as proscribed by this legislation are curtailed in its effort to limit the authority of the Executive orders.

The ability of the Executive Branch to carry out its Executive Orders without improper or overbearing congressional restrictions on such actions is of utmost importance to our Democracy and the continued growth and betterment of our country.

And while executive orders are not expressly addressed in the U.S. Constitution and no statute grants the President the general power to issue them, executive orders have always been accepted as an inherent and necessary aspect of presidential power and function of our government since its inception.

The legislation, however, oversteps the boundaries of our nation's governmental functions by attempting to override critically important and vital actions our democracy needs and has historically accepted as an inherent facet of separate functioning branches of our government.

Imposing such broad and ambiguous oversight of executive orders as proposed by H.R. 347 would only serve as an unnecessary and improper restriction on the powers of the Presidential executive orders, while also perpetuating a waste of government resources and further hindering American economic growth.

As such, I urge all my colleagues to oppose this onerous and unnecessary bill.

Madam Chair, I ask for support of the Jackson Lee amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I request a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 118-4.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 2(d), add the following:

(4) SIGNIFICANT IMPACT.—The term "significant impact" means, with respect to a major Executive order, that such order is estimated to increase or decrease Consumer Price Index inflation by at least 1 percentage point over the course of a year.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 166, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, we cannot run the government by ambiguity, confusion, lack of clarity, and just throwing language down on the floor and expecting all the pieces of government to work together.

I question whether this legislation and the legislation dealing with the Congressional Review Act is ever going to be passed in the United States Senate. I question that. It would have been nice to have hearings and work together.

This amendment tries to bring clarity. My amendment tries to define the term "significant impact." The term "significant impact on inflation" means an executive order was estimated to increase or decrease Consumer Price Index inflation by at least

1 percentage point over the course of a year. This amendment does clarify that the meaning of “significant impact on inflation” is quantifiable in any effort to make such a determination.

The lack of specificity of applicability for when this unnecessary legislative restriction would take place, and mandate, will be imposed on all executive orders, as provided for in the bill, is unnecessary, time-consuming, and a waste of resources. In fact, I don’t even know how any President would get through it.

I am not saying that executive orders should not have their necessary oversight. They can. The Oversight and Accountability Committee and other jurisdictional committees can have oversight.

If this is to reduce inflation, all this bill will do is raise the costs of any act or action that is asked for in the executive order.

Jackson Lee amendment No. 7 would help to ensure that any attempt to restrict the powers and authority of executive orders is curtailed in a manner that would limit such mandate to apply only in such scenario whereby economically accepted standards are considered and applied.

For example, “significant impact on inflation” is limited to instances where there has been an increase or decrease in the Consumer Price Index, the CPI, inflation by at least 1 percent over the course of a year. With that in mind, we would have clarity; we would have an understanding; and we would be able to know whether this is irrelevant, burdensome, and overly excessive in doing the work on behalf of the American people.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to support Jackson Lee amendment No. 7, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, this amendment defines a “significant impact on inflation” as only an impact that would increase or decrease the Consumer Price Index by at least 1 percentage point.

With all due respect, that is magical thinking. If a single executive order were to produce a full 1 percentage point increase in inflation, that would not be just a significant effect; it would be a massive effect.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics’ inflation data from January 23, 2023, showed that the Consumer Price Index rose 6.4 percent over the prior year. A 1 percent point rise would constitute 16 percent of that yearly rise. That is a huge portion of yearly inflation.

Few individual executive orders, even ones that stoke inflation significantly, would on their own raise inflation by 1 full percentage point or more.

What the amendment really is trying to do is gut the bill.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. LEE of Florida). The gentlewoman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), the ranking member of the Oversight and Accountability Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I want to speak in strong support of the gentlewoman’s amendment. I thank Ms. JACKSON LEE for her leadership in terms of real economic policy, which is about making the government an instrument of well-being and public good.

We know we have serious philosophical differences with our friends across the aisle. Many of them wanted to dismantle Social Security and Medicare. When President Biden arrived the other day, a lot of them retreated very quickly from it.

I would be delighted if someone wants to challenge me on that because we have all the quotations from all the Republican Senators and Representatives that said it was time to get rid of Social Security and phase it out, adopt means testing, increase the age, so on and so forth.

That is a real policy difference. What they have done here really falls under the category of symbolic politics. The good gentlewoman from Texas has done her best to make this meaningful, and I thank her for giving me the opportunity to say that.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for further clarifying our intent.

Usually, inflation, by the economists, is around 2 percent. To have this amendment that indicates 1 percent, it gives some clarity of a significant impact.

I would say this: I believe in oversight, but I don’t believe in obstruction, intrusion, and stopping work that impacts the American people.

My amendment provides clarity so that the work for the American people can go forward. It is evident that President Biden has had a significant impact on bringing down inflation and building a better quality of life.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to support Jackson Lee amendment No. 7, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

□ 1845

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 118-4.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 2(d), add the following:

(4) QUANTIFIABLE INFLATIONARY IMPACT.—The term “quantifiable inflationary impact” means, with respect to a major Executive order, that such order is estimated to increase or decrease Consumer Price Index inflation by at least 1 percentage point over the course of a year.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 166, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, all of us have seen the great work of the Oversight and Reform Committee in the two initiatives that we have had today.

Clearly, we are all sort of stretching to try to understand the impact of the Reduce Exacerbated Inflation Negatively Impacting the Nation Act, and we are trying to find the substance.

So my previous amendment was dealing with significant impact, and now we are dealing with quantifiable inflationary impact. I wanted to add as to what this actually means.

So my amendment says quantifiable inflationary impact means an executive order was estimated to increase or decrease Consumer Price Index inflation by at least 1 percentage point over the course of a year knowing that inflation is usually 2 percent a year.

I am just trying to find light in darkness and to try to understand what this bill is doing and to give those who are in government to do good, those who are trying to solve problems with a legitimate executive order to have some guidance that relates to inflation and not be of no substance with a bottomless pit, to be very honest with you, Madam Chair.

I am hoping my colleagues will join me in trying to give some guidance and some quantifiable definition to quantifiable inflationary input by tracking it to what has traditionally been by economists inflation 2 percent. We just went to 1 percent to give some definition to this to give some ability for anyone to understand how to analyze or utilize this legislation if it ever gets to the President’s desk.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, this amendment is similar to my colleague's last amendment. It defines a "quantifiable inflationary impact" as only an impact that would increase or decrease the Consumer Price Index by at least 1 percentage point.

If a given executive order did not have that level of impact, the bill, if amended this way, would require no inflation impact assessment.

But as my colleague's prior amendment, this amendment would not improve the bill, but instead gut the bill.

Letting off the hook all executive orders with less than 1 percentage point impact on the Consumer Price Index would mean that all or virtually all orders would be off the hook. That includes those with obviously significant inflationary effects.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Chair, let me quickly say that, again, the Jackson Lee amendment before us is keeping in line with nationally recognized standards.

Many economists agree that a quantifiable inflationary impact is deemed to occur when there is an increase or decrease in the Consumer Price Index inflation by at least 1 percent and over the course of a year. It will not gut the bill. It will let us try to understand the bill.

While H.R. 347 is a clear overreach and would impose improper and onerous restrictions upon the executive branch, the Jackson Lee amendment tries to find some common ground that will be offered to this body as a mere attempt to help ensure that the inappropriate limitations as prescribed by this legislation are curtailed in its effort to limit the authority of the executive orders.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to consider and vote for the Jackson Lee amendment No. 8, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MRS. LEE OF NEVADA.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 118-4.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, after line 2, add the following:

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to suggest that the task of combating inflation and bringing down the cost of living is the sole

responsibility of the Executive Office of the President, and not also a key pursuit of the United States House of Representatives during the 118th Congress through thoughtful, productive legislative action.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 166, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of my amendment to H.R. 347, the Reduce Exacerbated Inflation Negatively Impacting the Nation Act.

My amendment underscores the fact that it is not the sole responsibility of the executive office of the President to reduce inflation, but that productive, bipartisan legislative action is the best way that we can collectively combat inflation and bring down the cost of living.

I represent southern Nevada, a part of the country that has been especially hit hard by the price hikes driven up by the pandemic, supply chain disruptions, and Putin's invasion of Ukraine.

Nevadan families have been hurting. They have been forced to make difficult decisions about how to make ends meet and how to provide for their loved ones for far too long, and they are tired of finger-pointing. They are done with partisan potshots and bickering that achieve nothing to help them make ends meet.

Although the pace of inflation has slowed since hitting a peak last summer, the cost of living continues to remain far too high, and that is why they and the rest of America are calling on Congress for us to do our job, to take real action, and to provide relief. That is what we owe them.

We made progress in this direction during the last Congress with the CHIPS and Science Act, the bipartisan infrastructure package, and other landmark bills that continue to help strengthen our supply chains and relieve price pressures.

This Congress we need to continue that legacy and set aside political posturing and instead advance more thoughtful legislation that will actually bring down costs and meet the needs of our constituents.

I have said it before, and I will say it again: Congress is at our best when we put policy first and politics last.

I implore all of my colleagues to support this amendment because finding bipartisan compromise and real progress on our Nation's most pressing issue is not only right, it is what we were sent here to do.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I rise in favor of Mrs. LEE's excellent amendment here which makes both powerful economic points and powerful constitutional points.

The economic point is that Congress must act in order to bring down infla-

tion, Congress must act in order to promote employment, and we have acted in partnership with President Biden to do just that in the Inflation Reduction Act, in the infrastructure act, and in a whole series of bills that we have used to bring inflation down and to dramatically lower unemployment in the country.

But she is making also, I believe, a very powerful constitutional point because part of what gets lost in the symbolism of this legislation—a mere messaging bill about having executive orders over \$1 billion, which describes a handful in a year attached in an inflation description—what gets lost is that the Constitution in Article I sets it up so that Congress is the major definer of economic policy in the country.

It is Congress that is supposed to be laying and collecting taxes and impost and dealing with the debt of the country. It is Congress that regulates commerce among the States and with foreign countries.

So the failure to come forward with real productive legislation on inflation is also a surrender to the executive branch, and we don't need to do that.

So we should be working with the executive branch as we have done in the Inflation Reduction Act, with the infrastructure bill, in lowering prescription drug costs, and in lowering the costs for diabetics to get their insulin shots to \$35 a month. That is the real pathway, not just a bunch of reporting bills.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, my colleague's amendment states an obvious fact: It is the responsibility of both the President and the House of Representatives to combat inflation. I have no quarrel with that.

In fact, in advancing this bill, the House is taking one step toward fulfilling its responsibility to combat inflation.

It is doing so by using this legislative authority to help ensure that the President focuses on combating inflation, not issuing executive orders that make inflation worse.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR.
LANGWORTHY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 118-4.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, as the designee of Mr. ANDY OGLES, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 11, after "consumer" insert "or producer".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 166, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleague's amendment makes sure that inflation assessments prepared under the bill will address a critical inflationary measure—the Producer Price Index.

Now, when people think of inflation, they usually think of the Consumer Price Index. But the Producer Price Index is critical as well. It measures changes in the selling prices domestic producers receive for their output. These prices are from the very first commercial transactions for many products and services. Thus, changes in the Producer Price Index can signal that changes in prices are about to ripple through the economy.

These should be accounted for in each inflation impact assessment that the bill requires.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. As far as I understand, the amendment just adds one more unnecessary detail to the report, creating greater administrative burden and taxpayer costs that are still undefined. It is unclear why it is necessary. If it is necessary, it should be adopted across the board. But, of course, we had no hearing so we can't really understand what the merits of the proposal are, but right now, it just seems like a lot more bureaucratic paperwork.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, I have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1900

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BEAN of Florida) having assumed the chair, Ms. LEE of Florida, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 347) to require the Executive Office of the President to provide an inflation estimate with respect to Executive orders with a significant effect on the annual gross budget, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ENHANCED SAFETY REQUIREMENTS FOR TRAINS CARRYING HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

(Mr. DELUZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELUZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the fact that when Norfolk Southern's train derailed next to my district—leaking chemicals, evacuating constituents, and distressing thousands—the people of western Pennsylvania were mad, and so was I.

That is why my first bill in Congress is to take on the railroads. Today, the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) and I introduced the DERAIL Act, which ensures trains carrying hazardous materials are properly classified and have increased safety requirements. It is long overdue, but rail industry lobbyists have fought against it.

This derailment included hazardous materials, but since the train wasn't classified properly, it didn't have stricter safety rules. That is why we need the DERAIL Act.

This bill is for everyone in Beaver County, East Palestine. It is for everyone who has heard about this derailment and thought: "Could this happen here?" The terrible reality is yes, it could, but if colleagues from both parties join together, it doesn't have to.

Let's tell the railroads we won't let them recklessly pursue profit and endanger our communities and workers.

I will keep fighting to hold Norfolk Southern accountable for every penny of pain they have caused.

BUILDING A MORE EQUITABLE ECONOMY FOR ALL

(Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the last day of Black History Month to celebrate the remarkable contributions of Black businessowners.

Business ownership leads to higher incomes and more wealth, but decades of systemic bias, redlining, lending discrimination, and inequity in wages have created an ever-widening wealth gap for minority communities.

According to the Alliance for Entrepreneurial Equity, Black-owned businesses are three to five times more likely to be labeled as a high credit risk, which sets up barriers to affordable financing and slows growth. During the height of the pandemic, minority-owned firms were more likely to be completely shut out of credit and capital resources, receiving none of the financing they sought out.

This Black History Month, I met with entrepreneurs in my district who drive our economy forward, people like Malik Muhammad, owner of an independent bookstore in Baldwin Hills. Malik is passionate about investing in the community and does so by hosting bookfairs at local schools because he knows that in order for his neighborhood to thrive, more people of color need to start businesses in the community.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in Congress to recognize the great strength that is Black entrepreneurship and work with me to build a more equitable economy for all.

CONGRATULATING JOANNA MCCLINTON

(Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you proud—proud of Pennsylvania; proud of my Democratic colleagues in the Pennsylvania House; proud of the thousands of volunteers who helped deliver a statehouse majority last November in Pennsylvania, a house majority that on this last day of Black History Month is celebrating history—or should I say her-story—Pennsylvania made today.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate and celebrate Representative Joanna McClinton, my colleague, my friend, and, as of today, speaker of the Pennsylvania House, the first woman, the first African-American woman, to be called Madam Speaker.

Speaker McClinton follows in the footsteps of men like Leroy Irvis, the first African-American speaker of the Pennsylvania House, and African-American trailblazers like Barbara Jordan and Karen Bass.

What a crucial time in our State's history, our Nation's history, to have Speaker McClinton lead us, a time when we can fairly fund our education, rebuild roads, and combat gun violence and the opioid epidemic while protecting the planet for our children and children to come.

Joanna, a mother, a minister, a former public defender, now our speaker, what a way to end Black History Month. Congratulations to the Pennsylvania House. Congratulations, and Godspeed, Speaker McClinton.

SALT DEDUCTION MUST BE INCREASED

(Mr. SANTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SANTOS. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to introduce my bill, the SALT Relief Act.

My bill will increase the State and local taxes cap deduction from \$10,000 to \$50,000. Increasing the SALT deduction is a step in the right direction to lessen the burden of combined Federal, State, and local taxes during these times of economic hardship.

New York has one of the highest tax rates in the country, ranking above—including Federal, State, and local taxes.

In 2018, for Nassau County, the average SALT amount—property tax, income, or sales tax liability—reported among itemizing filers was \$30,227.21, but due to the \$10,000 cap, the average SALT deduction actually claimed was \$9,023.79.

Let it be known that the SALT tax is not a tax break for the wealthy but a tax relief for working-class families. This is about the 118th Congress working to ease the affordability burden in high-tax States like New York.

The cost of living continues to plague New Yorkers. Raising the cap on SALT will provide real tax relief, not just to New York's Third Congressional District but to all in America.

MATH ALWAYS WINS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, tonight, we are going to try to do sort of the continuation on the theme, but we are going to actually end it up with a dozen or so solutions.

I know the Parliamentarian said I can't hold my 8-month-old, but I wanted to prove the 8-month-old was real.

Look, there are some realities I keep coming behind these microphones to try to explain, and I continue to be just enraged, particularly to my brothers and sisters on the left, by the avoidance of the math.

My little boy, who is 8 months old, in 25 years, according to CBO, his taxes will have to be doubled. Corporate taxes will have to be doubled. Tariffs will have to be doubled. Everything has to double just to maintain baseline services. That is the math.

How many discussions have you heard here even today, over the last month, the reality of the math? The math will always win.

Once again, I am going to walk through some of what is really going on. For everyone here who says, "We are going to balance in 10 years," okay, I can do it, but you have to understand the amount of bloodletting that is re-

quired to actually make that math work.

The actual structural problem is actually not on the left, not on the right; it is demographics, something we are terrified of.

What the President did in his State of the Union speech was just unconscionable when he basically used Social Security and Medicare as props for his reelection instead of telling the truth. In a decade, the Medicare trust fund is gone. In a decade, the Social Security trust fund is gone.

Does the left plan to help us fix it? If they don't, they get to be responsible for doubling senior poverty in this country. It is the math.

I have started with this board now for multiple years. The new numbers are coming out, and they are actually worse. The United States functionally has \$114 trillion of borrowing, and it is all, every dime of it, Social Security and Medicare. The rest of the budget actually has a positive balance.

We got old. Look, I am a gray hair with a child. Maybe I am pathologically optimistic, but it is hard to fix a problem when you work in a place where your brothers and sisters will not look you in the eye and say: I understand the driver of our debt is our demographics.

For those of you with this up on YouTube, read the comments. About half the folks get it. About half the folks, the absurdities are just heart-breaking. "Tax rich people. That takes care of it." "Get rid of congressional salaries." We actually did the math. The funny thing is, if you get rid of all the Senate salaries and House salaries, it is 28 minutes of borrowing. That was last year's number. In 10 years, it is like 12 minutes of borrowing.

People have no concept. You can get every dime of foreign aid, and it is about 12 days of the borrowing.

Let's actually start to walk through to understand structurally how much trouble we are actually in.

Reducing the discretionary spending to zero—remember, the point I am trying to make here is you just got rid of all the military; you just got rid of the White House; you just got rid of Congress; you just got rid of the Supreme Court; you got rid of the EPA; you got rid of the IRS; you got rid of everything, all discretionary money. The only thing you are paying is Medicare, Social Security, the earned benefits, some of the Medicaid, veterans benefits, what we call mandatory around here.

When you get to about 10 years—remember, you have just wiped out the government; all you are doing is paying the benefits. When you actually remove all the mandatory, you are still having to borrow a couple hundred billion dollars.

When the clown show comes and says, "If we just got rid of this or that, we would be fine," it is not true. Your government functionally is an insurance company with an army, an insur-

ance company that technically is broke.

Let's walk through some of the math. I am going to do this over and over, and maybe one of these slides will actually help it sink in.

I have to throw something out that is just annoying. The room is empty. That is okay. People are in their offices working. We are on thousands of televisions around this place. I have given up on so many of my fellow Members, but maybe the staff, maybe the staff that is sitting there trying to figure out the math and the policy and what is going to go on, maybe they are listening.

This is where we are at. Remember, this was just done last week. The Congressional Budget Office updated a bunch of the math.

Our shortfall over the next 30 years is \$21 trillion on Social Security. Remember, Social Security still has a trust fund, but in 10 years, the trust fund is gone.

I don't think I brought the charts, but I have done it over and over. The average American who works their 40 quarters and those things, you get every dime you put in plus a SPIF.

□ 1915

You would have made a lot more money if you put it in the market or other places, but remember, there were discussions to try to do that 25 years ago. The left went nuts, so it didn't happen. It is mathematically impossible to do today.

But Medicare functionally has \$48 trillion of shortfall because the trust fund on Medicare, which is only the part A, the hospital, part of the doctor portion, is empty in 10 years.

So when you are seeing us talk about a 10-year budget, one of the great little lies around here is we are not telling you that on the 11th year it gets a hell of a lot worse.

Because are you going to backfill Medicare? Backfill Social Security?

Transportation Trust Fund, Highway Trust Fund is also gone at that time, too.

Then you put in these over the 30 years and then add in another \$47 trillion of interest. You start to understand when you are seeing the new scoring, looks more like a—if you do a 30-year math on it, on this latest CBO update, you have to do a little bit of imputing of the math, you're probably approaching about \$128 trillion, not that \$114 trillion on the first slide.

It is actually over the next 9 budget years—I know one says 10—just Medicare goes up another trillion dollars in spend. And then it really starts to take off because the trust fund is gone.

So when the President basically said we are not going to touch Social Security and Medicare, I agree. They are earned. They are earned. But where was the next sentence saying: And I plan to work with Republicans to keep them, to keep them solvent, to keep them here, instead of the clown show

that is going on right now and saying, well, we are not allowed to talk about it.

I had protestors at my office a couple days ago saying don't touch Social Security.

Okay. We don't touch it in, what?

Now it is, what, 9½ years. Are you ready for your 23 percent cut?

Because that is what the actuaries say is coming. Then the next year it gets bigger, and the cut gets bigger, and the cut gets bigger, and the cut gets bigger. And our back-of-the-napkin math is at that time you functionally double senior poverty.

So the clown show around here goes: You can't talk about Social Security. It has become a political issue. The President actually used it in the State of the Union.

Okay. I am going to show you some of the Democrat solutions and the absurdity of the math.

I need my brothers and sisters all here if you give a damn. Put some batteries in the calculator, hire a couple competent actuaries. Actually, try something even crazier, and for anyone that is watching or listening, go grab—you have to two different documents out there. The one is really an easy read, high school math. You will be fine.

The Congressional Budget Office, about 6 weeks ago, did an update on Social Security. It is an easy read. A little harder read but actually much more impactful. Go actually get the copy of the Social Security Medicare actuary report—or is it Medicare Social Security actuary report? Either way. Dig through that, and you will understand the demographic curve.

I am going to show you some demographic slides. And I promise you, I am going to upset some people, and maybe it is a little too geeky.

My father used to have a saying: For every complex problem, there is a simple solution.

That is absolutely wrong.

We are talking trillions of dollars. We are talking about millions and millions and millions of our brothers and sisters.

Guess what? Solutions are complex.

Is this body capable? I don't know if it is anymore.

Part of the problem is we have politicized everything to the point that we are incapable of telling the truth, because often telling the truth either gets you unelected or screws up the fundraising or other things.

I just continue to be enraged. Does my little boy—do you deserve a retirement? Does he deserve a future?

Because the wheels are coming off.

I just showed you a slide that said 10 years from now I can wipe out everything you think is government, and you still have to borrow money.

And no, China has actually been dialing down its bond holdings for a decade. Japan has been dialing down their bond holdings for decades.

We now finance most of our borrowing ourselves—actually almost all

of our borrowing ourselves. Single fail bond auction. You want to talk about hell?

At a future time I will actually walk you through scenarios of what happens when we go to sell U.S. sovereign debt and it is undersubscribed and watch the interest rate go through the ceiling because you have to sell it.

So let's take a quick look, just to understand the baseline structure of what has happened to Social Security. And once again, no one stole your money.

That was a rhetorical thing that politicians did to sound like they cared because they didn't want to tell you the actual math, and the actual math was demographics.

Social Security by the numbers: In 1960, I had 5 workers for every retiree, for every beneficiary.

How far away is 2030? Come on. Seriously, can anyone help me do some math here?

How far away is 2030?

Think of that. At the end of the decade, if you are married, you and your partner, your spouse, you got your own retiree.

Does that help explain part of the math problem? Understand in the early days for a working male on the very first year of Social Security, I have seen it documented that the average life expectancy was 64 years old, and you didn't get the benefit until you were 65.

You see some of the design issues?

Yes, it was a major update in, what, 1983. Tip O'Neill sitting in that chair over there; Ronald Reagan in the White House. They did difficult things. They shored it up. But now we have hit the baby boom curve.

We have divided government again just like we did back in the 1980s. What a magical time for us both to hold hands and save it, because you have a math problem. You got two workers for every beneficiary.

How much did you see the President in the state of the Union show like he gave a damn for anyone that is on Social Security?

I am not going to touch it.

Then what was his next sentence that is going off the cliff?

There are some very creative structural ideas, almost setting up either a sovereign wealth fund, some incentives where you actually get benefited to stay in the labor market and other things. We can save it with no one taking a cut. It is just going to require math and a lot of explaining.

This is pretty much another way of seeing the same slide of how many workers per retiree.

This is for my Democrat brothers and sisters. And I know this is done as a percentage of the economy which, believe it or not, when you actually look at the actuary reports, that is how we actually structurally look at programs like this that require trillions of dollars to finance.

We actually sort of say, here is the percentage of the economy that actu-

ally goes to that benefit. Total tax revenues raised in combined Federal, State, and payroll taxes approach 100 percent for wealthy taxpayers as a percentage of GDP.

It is basically saying what would happen if we functionally took 100 percent of the income from the wealthy. Once again, let's try this again, because there are a couple trolls out there saying, well oh, BERNIE SANDERS had this idea.

Okay. He does. If you can read through it, the amount of all the wealth income is just to shore up Social Security, and then they forget three-quarters of the borrowing is Medicare. You get 4 percent of GDP if you take all the taxes we are already paying and then add in functionally 100 percent tax on the income for the wealthy.

The problem is, the spending on just Social Security and Medicare is 6 percent, so you still got 2 percent of the entire economy as a shortfall.

And how much do you think if we took every dime of the wealthiest income, what do you think the economy would look like?

What would the growth be?

What would the investment be?

You have to understand, I do these things, they are absurd. But the discussion around here is absurd.

“Well, if we just tax the wealthy more.” Well, maybe we should, but don't think it actually fixes the problem.

And here is where it gets more uncomfortable, but let's do some demographics.

First point: I think our math says in like 19 years or 19½ years, the United States has more deaths than births. So in less than 20 years, the United States has more deaths than births.

I need you to think through that. Remember, a Social Security actuary is modeled for 75 years. In less than two decades, I have started having more deaths than births in this country.

And you start to understand what they call—it is actually a demographic term—a dependency ratio. And it turns out the three biggest economies in the world—the United States, China, Japan—and this is a little hard to read but it is worth the concept. I also am an outlier in my belief that much of what China does is because this curve collapsing down here is China. It is basically what they call dependency ratio, the number of folks they have that will be dependent on a worker.

Right now, today, they are healthier than the United States. They have more workers than dependents but their curve folds incredibly hard.

This one is the United States. We basically sort of fall and fall and fall and sort of flatline.

Japan is already in just a miserable state.

This is happening all around the industrialized world. We don't have enough kids. It is math. It is demographics.

So are we ready to embrace some pretty radical concepts?

There are some great authors out there that talk about how the 1970s and 1980s, and maybe even through part of the 1990s, the world had competition for what they called hydrocarbons: oil, natural gas.

In the previous decade and right up to today, it may be a world sort of competition for rare-earth elements because of electrification and batteries and those things. The next couple decades it may be an international battle for smart people.

Take a look at how many of the countries we compete with that have changed their immigration codes to actually recruit people who have skill sets. And it is not all just Ph.D.'s or electrical engineering. It is if you are a skilled carpenter, if you are a skilled programmer; if you are this or that. It is actually a really interesting and uncomfortable debate.

But as you are going to see, as we talk about these charts, I can make the numbers work. On one hand of the ledger, we need economic growth, and we need a lot of it.

Well, the way you get there is through fixing the regulatory system. The way you get there is from an economy that starts to become incredibly competitive again instead of the protection racket it has become today. We also have to fix the immigration system where you are not importing poverty, but you are importing talent, so you have economic growth.

Remember, the trick here is over the coming decades I need the debt to not grow faster than the size of the economy. You need that, too. We all need it, and so does my little 8-month-old.

We are going to compete against the world because the rest of the world is also—at least the industrialized world—is facing the same demographic collapse.

And now we get into the stuff that becomes really uncomfortable to talk about, and I have to find a way, but it is math and it is policy.

There is something really crappy going on in our society right now, and it is uncomfortable. I may be the only idiot who is dumb enough to walk up behind these microphones and talk about it, but we have a problem.

We have young males entering universities, almost similar to females, and then not graduate. I didn't bring all the charts, but the number of young males, particularly under 35, who just are functionally not showing up in the economy.

And why this is important?

I am not talking about a few. I am talking about millions and millions and millions. We are actually even looking at some of these charts. And where this gets to be a tricky conversation is when you start to see college enrollment by gender and then the males basically falling off the cliff here, particularly the last few years, where females graduated.

Great. This is wonderful over here. This is a real societal problem.

□ 1930

There is a cultural concept called marriageable populations, and I will see if I can weave this into this unified theory.

If I have a young woman that has worked her heart out, she has graduated, and the pool of available spouses are people that did not graduate, we are actually seeing what we call a marriageability gap. And we see that across the board, across ethnicities, and now it is really starting to show up in our economic data of slowing down our economic growth projections.

When you get someone who says, well, I can do this, I will do a tax cut here, I will do this here, and I get all this economic growth, I got a problem. I got a whole bunch of my society that is not entering either the workforce, they are not forming families, they are not having kids. The basic structure that builds both a society, a healthy community, but also actually builds that economic underpinning of that society. It is worth studying. It is worth digging in to.

We got to understand what is happening with young men, because it is such a large number now. We see it in our economic data as basically stultifying—if that is a word—the economic growth.

You have a world now where my brothers and sisters on the left, my Democrat colleagues run around saying, well, we have this low unemployment. And then you look at the available populations that should be in the labor force, but they don't show up in the data because they are not even looking.

Remember, we have fewer people today in the labor force than we did before the pandemic, by millions. Then I stand up here just pissed off trying to say, does anyone care about the math? Because at the end of the decade, the wheels are coming off and they don't need to.

This is just more of the same, just sort of showing that the participation of prime age males, basically, continues to decline, decline, decline. The other chart actually may have done a better job of showing the cliff.

What have I tried to argue here? I have debt that is exploding and it is substantially healthcare costs. It is substantially our demographics. We got old.

I have a seesaw here that if we could get both sides in balance, there is a way it works, but you have got to over here have growth. I got to have labor force participation. I have to have encouragement for people, whether you are older and we incentivize you, saying, hey, we are not going to take your side of the FICA tax if you stay in the labor force and you are 70 but you feel that you want to work. Great. We love you. Please. Thank you.

How do I get young males back into the labor force, to get them to actually

graduate college? This is important. If you are a university, please pay attention to these numbers. There is something that is almost crisis level going on out there.

The adoption of technology in regulation. Do you need buildings full of file cabinets and paper to regulate the environment, or could you actually do it through technology? We are all walking around with a supercomputer in your pocket. Stick the little sensor on it and you could do air quality monitoring. I no longer need a building to file paperwork. I always know what is going on. You can crowdsource it.

There are ideas like this that both disrupt, shrink the size of government. Government is just far too massive, and you can replace much of it with technology. The battles I have in Ways and Means over the IRS. Do you hire an army of unionized workers or do you use technology? If you believe there is a bunch of tax cheats out there, use technology to find them, or do you think an army of unionized workers is a much better way to do it? That is absurd.

Growth ledger. What I am going to talk about now is some of the disruptive ideas. Maybe a number of these won't work. Maybe they are just techno utopianism, but it is the thought process. It is the mental discipline to start thinking through the basic idea of, if I had a vibrant, competitive, disruptive economy that is actually crashing the price of healthcare over here and growing over here, I can do the math on that. I can show you that we can flatten out this debt bomb that is about to wipe out your retirement and my kids' future.

I want to give just a simple thought experiment, except it is real. Do you remember a half an hour ago, the Democrats touting in the Inflation Reduction Act, we are going to spend billions and billions and billions and billions of dollars subsidizing insulin? We are going to give the very companies that they used to come to the floor here and scream about that they were pillaging people with the cost of insulin.

We are going to give that Big Pharma money. That is how the brain trust on my left here works. Right over here in Virginia, there is a co-op. Remember, most of the insulin formulas are off-patent.

This group over here—and it is insurance companies, it is hospitals. I think a couple State Medicaid systems got together and said, screw it. We don't like the price the market is giving us. We are going to build a co-op and do it ourselves. We are going to make eight types of generic insulin. Oh, by the way, they are doing it less than the government subsidized price the Democrats pushed through where they are handing out billions of dollars.

Why didn't they turn around and say, let's bring this to market much faster? No taxpayer money. Cheaper prices. Competition. Instead the Democrats'

version was, let's just subsidize Big Pharma. How dare they act like they did something? They basically almost screwed up competition because they started subsidizing the very organizations they used to complain about and then made it so competition actually had to now compete with subsidized companies.

Does anyone else see the absurdity around here? If you want competition in the pharmaceutical world, get more people making them. The majority of the pharmaceuticals we all consume are off-patent. There are some crazy articles out there that I saw this summer of super high-speed 3D printers that you no longer need a couple hundred million dollar clean facility to make your generic drug. There are alternative ways to produce it.

What could we do regulatorywise, tax incentivewise, other things here to actually say, we want everyone and their cousin making safe, affordable, competitive pharmaceuticals if that is part of the fight that we have here saying these drug prices are too high?

What are you going to do? The Democrats actually decided they are going to regulate price cap, subsidize. As a supply side conservative, I come back and say, screw that. Let's grab today's technology and get the competition flowing.

I do not know all the details on this. I only saw part of the article this weekend, but this is the thought experiment I need from you.

How many of you saw the article this weekend that Apple basically believes they have broken the code for a glucose monitor in the watch?

Think about that, if you are a thinking person. If I came to you tomorrow and said, you can put something on your wrist—maybe it is not, because they are expensive, but it is the concept of the technology.

I can have something on my wrist that knows my oxygen, knows my blood pressure, knows my heart rate, knows my temperature, and now knows my glucose.

If you had all those datapoints, what could you run as an algorithm and also your ability to take my data 24 hours a day, 7 days a week?

Could you keep me much healthier? Could you keep our brothers and sisters healthier? Remember; diabetes is 33 percent of all healthcare spending. It is 31 percent of all Medicare spending.

If it is true this technology may be coming, just a thought experiment. You are all smart people. Think about it.

What would happen if I could take my prediabetic population, even some of my diabetic population that may not now be on insulin and said, we are going to work with you so you understand what is going on?

I represent probably the second highest per capita population in the world with diabetes; one of my Tribal communities in Arizona.

Incredible people, and they are not poor. They are a gaming tribe along-

side Scottsdale. They are very entrepreneurial. They have done great.

The data may be the disruption in the price of healthcare. Why am I the first idiot to walk up to the floor and say, I saw this. We should actually investigate it. We should understand what this could mean.

If we invited the scientists in to talk to us and say, what does the future look like? What would happen if it is true?

I am going to show another thing about a stem cell treatment that is going on from a San Diego company that believes they may have found a way—I think they have cured, like, six people of type 1 diabetes, but it is less than a year, so you don't know the efficacy.

The concept is there and the ability to stop someone from ever screwing up their islet cells.

The reason I show this stuff is instead of saying we are just going to walk in, and we are going to have to cut Medicare by trillions of dollars, how about the crazy thing of curing people and making the healthcare prices dramatically lower through technology, through disruption?

You have got a choice. This is not just a blunt, troglodyte approach. This is actually something where the society gets healthy and more prosperous.

I am just going to go through some of these because for some of these, I have done whole presentations on the floor.

When you start to actually read some of the literature, that we may be on the cusp of—I think, actually, there is a paper being presented in this coming week on the first data sets for a cancer vaccine, some of the drugs that are having just incredible success in curing people.

You have the ability to actually have that supercomputer you carry around in your pocket basically actually help you manage your personal health.

I have hypertension. I have to take a calcium inhibitor. I came here a couple weeks ago and showed, once again, another thought experiment.

Mr. Speaker, 16 percent of all healthcare spending is? Sixteen percent of all healthcare spending is? This is \$550 billion a year, so over a half a trillion dollars a year. It is calculated to be people not taking their pharmaceuticals.

So you have hypertension like me. I take my calcium inhibitor. I take one pill every day, and I don't stroke out.

They say 16 percent of healthcare spending is people choosing not to; darn it, I forgot. I didn't take the pill.

Now, I know some people are going to say, well, you should eat healthy. You should exercise. Trust me; I do. I haven't touched ice cream in a couple years. I really miss it.

But walk through just the concept with me, instead of your preconceived conceptions or notions. So 16 percent of healthcare spending is people not taking their pharmaceuticals appropriately so they stay on their rhythm.

Grandma forgets to take her pill. You need a statin. You forget to take it. How about a \$0.99 pill cap that beeps at you when you forgot to open it up that morning?

Is that \$0.99 worth what it would mean to go at \$550 billion? What if you could just shave off a couple points of it? \$200 billion; is that worth it?

These are just trying to be creative instead of the folks who want to run around here with a chainsaw hacking apart things. Start saying maybe the idea is using technology so we are healthier.

There is another article I picked up a couple days ago just to show the revolution that is about to be here. This now has FDA approval.

Functionally, you can blow into it from your home medicine cabinet, and guess what? It is a flu test. It is a COVID test. There is another version coming that is actually going to be two or three other things.

You can have it in your home medicine cabinet, and you can blow in it. You don't have to go to the urgent care center. You don't have to go to the doctor's office. You don't have to go to the emergency room. You don't have to go to the hospital.

The technology is the disruption. The disruption actually crashes the price.

□ 1945

These are uncomfortable. I had this really neat article. It is a bit geeky, but it basically talks about the ability to use an X-ray. Now, with some of the predictive AI looking at it, it can actually do amazing—amazingly accurate, cheaply—diagnostics on whether you are going to have a risk of heart disease or other things.

It is here, and it has gone through the efficacy trials. Do we set up the policy where we make these things reimbursable? Do we make these things so we take down the barriers because, remember, Washington often is more like a protection racket.

I have done whole presentations on this from a couple of years ago. Yes, it has actually moved forward to some of the immunotherapies for some of the types of cancers. These are coming about.

Now, the one that I talked about a couple of weeks ago was that possibility in regard to diabetes. We are actually bringing a couple of their researchers here, I think sometime next month, to talk about the mechanisms.

The reason I walked through all of these, the first part of this presentation, is to understand how devastating the debt is. It is not pretend. You can't just say, "Well, we will just pretend. We will print a \$1 trillion coin and walk away from it." You have to stop the clown show.

Yes, there is a whole bunch of government that we can do without, but you saw the very first couple of boards that basically said, 10 years from now, you can get rid of all of what you think is government, and you still have to

borrow money. You got rid of all of defense; you got rid of all the discretionary; and you still have to borrow money to be able to cover Medicare. The punch line there was it is the next year. That was all a 2033 number.

The next year, 2034, the Social Security trust fund is gone—23 percent cut. Is that going to be allowed to happen, or do we have to take it out of the general fund?

Next year, 2034, the Medicare trust fund is gone. The next year, the transportation highway trust fund is gone.

The second half of this was hope. I know some of this stuff is hard to process. It is hard sometimes to think, “Oh, I am going to disrupt. I am going to functionally legalize disruption.”

I have used this before, but it is the easiest. How many of you went to Blockbuster Video last week? Come on, work with me here. How many of you went and got that little silver disk last weekend? Of course not. “Schweikert, that is absurd.”

The fact of the matter is that technology came along. We started streaming. Now, you have how many choices? You sit there saying you have too many choices, that you can't make up my mind, instead of standing in line for the disk that wasn't there that you really wanted that you promised your family, so you come home with some crappy one, and they are all mad at you. That is not that long ago.

We have these types of disruptions in our society all the time. Stop being afraid of it.

Congress, damn it, stop acting like a protection racket where you protect incumbency—not incumbent elected, incumbent bureaucracies, incumbent business models.

Design the tax code. Design the regulatory code. If the Democrats continue insisting that they subsidize everything, fine. Design it so there is competition, not the chosen favorites that they want to hand a grant out to. That competition, I think, actually becomes the disruption that saves us.

If you have a better idea, one that makes Americans healthier, more prosperous, fixes your future retirement, fixes my little kid's future, I want to hear it. Right now, this is some of the best I have, and we have a whole portfolio of these things.

I beg of this place, please buy a calculator. Work through the math. Understand how devastating it is. Then, just try to think of a future. Try to think of a future that actually is incredibly hopeful, incredibly optimistic.

You can't have the sort of dystopian State of the Union speech we had, if you actually break it down, where they know these programs are going off the cliff, and the left cares so much more about winning the next election, they are not telling the truth to their own voters, let alone the people who are really dependent.

It is a level of cruelty. It is a cruelty that might work through the next election, but it is coming. The math always wins.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and to direct their remarks to the Chair.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ETHICS FOR THE 118TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Committee on Ethics, February 28, 2023.

HON. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to clause 2 of House Rule XI, I submit to the House the Rules of the Committee on Ethics for the 118th Congress, adopted February 28, 2023, for publication in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL GUEST,
Chairman.

FOREWORD

The Committee on Ethics is unique in the House of Representatives. Consistent with the duty to carry out its advisory and enforcement responsibilities in an impartial manner, the Committee is the only standing committee of the House of Representatives the membership of which is divided evenly by party. These rules are intended to provide a fair procedural framework for the conduct of the Committee's activities and to help ensure that the Committee serves well the people of the United States, the House of Representatives, and the Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives.

PART I—GENERAL COMMITTEE RULES

RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) So far as applicable, these rules and the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be the rules of the Committee and any subcommittee. The Committee adopts these rules under the authority of clause 2(a)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, 118th Congress.

(b) The rules of the Committee may be modified, amended, or repealed by a vote of a majority of the Committee.

(c) When the interests of justice so require, the Committee, by a majority vote of its members, may adopt any special procedures, not inconsistent with these rules, deemed necessary to resolve a particular matter before it. Copies of such special procedures shall be furnished to all parties in the matter.

(d) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member shall have access to such information that they request as necessary to conduct Committee business.

RULE 2. DEFINITIONS

(a) “Committee” means the Committee on Ethics.

(b) “Complaint” means a written allegation of improper conduct against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives filed with the Committee with the intent to initiate an inquiry.

(c) “Inquiry” means an investigation by an investigative subcommittee into allegations against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives.

(d) “Investigate,” “Investigating,” and/or “Investigation” mean review of the conduct of a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives that is conducted or authorized by the Committee, an investigative subcommittee, or the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(e) “Board” means the Board of the Office of Congressional Ethics.

(f) “Referral” means a report sent to the Committee from the Board pursuant to House Rules and all applicable House Resolutions regarding the conduct of a House Member, officer, or employee, including any accompanying findings or other supporting documentation.

(g) “Investigative Subcommittee” means a subcommittee designated pursuant to Rule 19(a) to conduct an inquiry to determine if a Statement of Alleged Violation should be issued.

(h) “Statement of Alleged Violation” means a formal charging document filed by an investigative subcommittee with the Committee containing specific allegations against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives of a violation of the Code of Official Conduct, or of a law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the performance of official duties or the discharge of official responsibilities.

(i) “Adjudicatory Subcommittee” means a subcommittee designated pursuant to Rule 23(a) that holds an adjudicatory hearing and determines whether the counts in a Statement of Alleged Violation are proved by clear and convincing evidence.

(j) “Sanction Hearing” means a Committee hearing to determine what sanction, if any, to adopt or to recommend to the House of Representatives.

(k) “Respondent” means a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives who is the subject of an investigation.

(l) “Office of Advice and Education” refers to the Office established by section 803(i) of the Ethics Reform Act of 1989. The Office handles inquiries; prepares written opinions in response to specific requests; develops general guidance; and organizes seminars, workshops, and briefings for the benefit of the House of Representatives.

(m) “Member” means a Representative in, or a Delegate to, or the Resident Commissioner to, the U.S. House of Representatives.

RULE 3. ADVISORY OPINIONS AND WAIVERS

(a) The Office of Advice and Education shall handle inquiries; prepare written opinions providing specific advice, including reviews of requests for privately-sponsored travel pursuant to the Committee's Travel Guidelines and Regulations; develop general guidance; and organize seminars, workshops, and briefings for the benefit of the House of Representatives.

(b) Any Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives may request a written opinion with respect to the propriety of any current or proposed conduct of such Member, officer, or employee.

(c) The Office of Advice and Education may provide information and guidance regarding laws, rules, regulations, and other standards of conduct applicable to Members, officers, and employees in the performance of their duties or the discharge of their responsibilities.

(d) In general, the Committee shall provide a written opinion to an individual only in response to a written request, and the written opinion shall address the conduct only of the inquiring individual, or of persons for whom the inquiring individual is responsible as employing authority.

(e) A written request for an opinion shall be addressed to the Chair of the Committee and shall include a complete and accurate statement of the relevant facts. A request shall be signed by the requester or the requester's authorized representative or employing authority. A representative shall disclose to the Committee the identity of the principal on whose behalf advice is being sought.

(f) Requests for privately-sponsored travel shall be treated like any other request for a written opinion for purposes of paragraphs (g) through (l).

(1) The Committee's Travel Guidelines and Regulations shall govern the request submission and Committee approval process for privately-sponsored travel consistent with House Rules.

(2) A request for privately-sponsored travel of a Member, officer, or employee shall include a completed and signed Traveler Form that attaches the Private Sponsor Certification Form and includes all information required by the Committee's Travel Guidelines and Regulations. A private sponsor offering officially-connected travel to a Member, officer, or employee must complete and sign a Private Sponsor Certification Form, and provide a copy of that form to the invitee(s).

(3) Any individual who knowingly and willfully falsifies, or who knowingly and willfully fails to file, any form required by the Committee's Travel Guidelines and Regulations may be subject to civil penalties and criminal sanctions pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

(g) The Office of Advice and Education shall prepare for the Committee a response to each written request for an opinion from a Member, officer, or employee. Each response shall discuss all applicable laws, rules, regulations, or other standards.

(h) Where a request is unclear or incomplete, the Office of Advice and Education may seek additional information from the requester.

(i) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to take action on behalf of the Committee on any proposed written opinion that they determine does not require consideration by the Committee. If the Chair or Ranking Minority Member requests a written opinion, or seeks a waiver, extension, or approval pursuant to Rules 3(m), 4(c), 4(e), or 4(h), the next ranking member of the requester's party is authorized to act in lieu of the requester.

(j) The Committee shall keep confidential any request for advice from a Member, officer, or employee, as well as any response thereto. Upon request of any Member, officer, or employee who has submitted a written request for an opinion or submitted a request for privately-sponsored travel, the Committee may release to the requesting individual a copy of their own written request for advice or submitted travel forms, any subsequent written communications between such individual and Committee staff regarding the request, and any Committee advisory opinion or travel letter issued to that individual in response. The Committee shall not release any internal Committee staff work product, communications, or notes in response to such a request, except as authorized by the Committee.

(k) The Committee may take no adverse action in regard to any conduct that has been undertaken in reliance on a written opinion if the conduct conforms to the specific facts addressed in the opinion.

(l) Information provided to the Committee by a Member, officer, or employee seeking advice regarding prospective conduct may not be used as the basis for initiating an investigation under clause 3(a)(2) or clause 3(b) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, if such Member, officer, or employee acts in good faith in accordance with the written advice of the Committee.

(m) A written request for a waiver of clause 5 of House Rule XXV (the House gift rule), or for any other waiver or approval, shall be treated in all respects like any other request for a written opinion.

(n) A written request for a waiver of clause 5 of House Rule XXV (the House gift rule) shall specify the nature of the waiver being

sought and the specific circumstances justifying the waiver.

(o) An employee seeking a waiver of time limits applicable to travel paid for by a private source shall include with the request evidence that the employing authority is aware of the request. In any other instance where proposed employee conduct may reflect on the performance of official duties, the Committee may require that the requester submit evidence that the employing authority knows of the conduct.

RULE 4. FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

(a) In matters relating to Title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, the Committee shall coordinate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Legislative Resource Center, to assure that appropriate individuals are notified of their obligation to file reports required to be filed under Title I of the Ethics in Government Act and that such individuals are provided in a timely fashion with filing instructions and forms developed by the Committee.

(b) The Committee shall coordinate with the Legislative Resource Center to assure that information that the Ethics in Government Act requires to be placed on the public record is made public.

(c) Any reports required to be filed under Title I of the Ethics in Government Act filed by Members of the Board of the Office of Congressional Ethics that are forwarded to the Committee by the Clerk shall not be subject to paragraphs (d) through (q) of this Rule. The Office of Congressional Ethics retains jurisdiction over review of the timeliness and completeness of filings by Members of the Board as the Board's supervising ethics office.

(d) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to grant on behalf of the Committee requests for reasonable extensions of time for the filing of Financial Disclosure Statements. Any such request must be received by the Committee no later than the date on which the Statement in question is due. A request received after such date may be granted by the Committee only in extraordinary circumstances. Such extensions for one individual in a calendar year shall not exceed a total of 90 days per Statement, including any amendment required by the Committee in accordance with clause (m). No extension shall be granted authorizing a nonincumbent candidate to file a statement later than 30 days prior to a primary or general election in which the candidate is participating.

(e) An individual who takes legally sufficient action to withdraw as a candidate before the date on which that individual's Financial Disclosure Statement is due under the Ethics in Government Act shall not be required to file a Statement. An individual shall not be excused from filing a Financial Disclosure Statement when withdrawal as a candidate occurs after the date on which such Statement was due.

(f) Any individual who files a report required to be filed under Title I of the Ethics in Government Act more than 30 days after the later of—

(1) the date such report is required to be filed, or

(2) if a filing extension is granted to such individual, the last day of the filing extension period, is required by such Act to pay a late filing fee of \$200. The Chair and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to approve requests that the fee be waived based on extraordinary circumstances.

(g) Any late report that is submitted without a required filing fee shall be deemed procedurally deficient and not properly filed.

(h) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to approve requests for

waivers of the aggregation and reporting of gifts as provided by section 102(a)(2)(C) of the Ethics in Government Act. If such a request is approved, both the incoming request and the Committee response shall be forwarded to the Legislative Resource Center for placement on the public record.

(i) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to approve blind trusts as qualifying under section 102(f)(3) of the Ethics in Government Act. The correspondence relating to formal approval of a blind trust, the trust document, the list of assets transferred to the trust, and any other documents required by law to be made public, shall be forwarded to the Legislative Resource Center for such purpose.

(j) The Committee shall designate staff who shall review reports required to be filed under Title I of the Ethics in Government Act and, based upon information contained therein, indicate in a form and manner prescribed by the Committee whether the Statement appears substantially accurate and complete and the filer appears to be in compliance with applicable laws and rules.

(k) Each report required to be filed under Title I of the Ethics in Government Act shall be reviewed within 60 days after the date of filing.

(l) If the reviewing staff believes that additional information is required because (1) the report required to be filed under Title I of the Ethics in Government Act appears not substantially accurate or complete, or (2) the filer may not be in compliance with applicable laws or rules, then the reporting individual shall be notified in writing of the additional information believed to be required, or of the law or rule with which the reporting individual does not appear to be in compliance. Such notice shall also state the time within which a response is to be submitted. Any such notice shall remain confidential.

(m) Within the time specified, including any extension granted in accordance with clause (d), a reporting individual who concurs with the Committee's notification that the report required to be filed under Title I of the Ethics in Government Act is not complete, or that other action is required, shall submit the necessary information or take appropriate action. Any amendment may be in the form of a revised report required to be filed under Title I of the Ethics in Government Act or an explanatory letter addressed to the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

(n) Any amendment shall be placed on the public record in the same manner as other reports required to be filed under Title I of the Ethics in Government Act. The individual designated by the Committee to review the original report required to be filed under Title I of the Ethics in Government Act shall review any amendment thereto.

(o) Within the time specified, including any extension granted in accordance with clause (d), a reporting individual who does not agree with the Committee that the report required to be filed under Title I of the Ethics in Government Act is deficient or that other action is required, shall be provided an opportunity to respond orally or in writing. If the explanation is accepted, a copy of the response, if written, or a note summarizing an oral response, shall be retained in Committee files with the original report.

(p) The Committee shall be the final arbiter of whether any report required to be filed under Title I of the Ethics in Government Act requires clarification or amendment.

(q) If the Committee determines, by vote of a majority of its members, that there is reason to believe that an individual has willfully failed to file a report required to be filed under Title I of the Ethics in Government Act or has willfully falsified or willfully failed to file information required to be

reported, then the Committee shall refer the name of the individual, together with the evidence supporting its finding, to the Attorney General pursuant to section 104(b) of the Ethics in Government Act. Such referral shall not preclude the Committee from initiating such other action as may be authorized by other provisions of law or the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 5. MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the second Tuesday of each month, except when the House of Representatives is not meeting on that day. When the Committee Chair determines that there is sufficient reason, meetings may be called on additional days. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held when the Chair determines there is no business to be considered.

(b) The Chair shall establish the agenda for meetings of the Committee, and the Ranking Minority Member may place additional items on the agenda.

(c) All meetings of the Committee or any subcommittee shall occur in executive session unless the Committee or subcommittee, by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members, opens the meeting to the public.

(d) Any hearing held by an adjudicatory subcommittee, or any sanction hearing held by the Committee, shall be open to the public unless the Committee or subcommittee, by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members, closes the hearing to the public.

(e) A subcommittee shall meet at the discretion of its Chair.

(f) Insofar as practicable, notice for any Committee or subcommittee meeting shall be provided at least seven days in advance of the meeting. The Chair of the Committee or subcommittee may waive such time period for good cause.

RULE 6. COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) The staff is to be assembled and retained as a professional, nonpartisan staff.

(b) Each member of the staff shall be professional and demonstrably qualified for the position for which the individual is hired.

(c) The staff as a whole and each individual member of the staff shall perform all official duties in a nonpartisan manner.

(d) No member of the staff shall engage in any partisan political activity directly affecting any congressional or presidential election.

(e) No member of the staff or outside counsel may accept public speaking engagements or write for publication on any subject that is in any way related to the employment or duties with the Committee of such individual without specific prior approval from the Chair and Ranking Minority Member.

(f) All staff members shall be appointed by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee. Such vote shall occur at the first meeting of the membership of the Committee during each Congress and as necessary during the Congress.

(g) Subject to the approval of the Committee on House Administration, the Committee may retain counsel not employed by the House of Representatives whenever the Committee determines, by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee, that the retention of outside counsel is necessary and appropriate.

(h) If the Committee determines that it is necessary to retain staff members for the purpose of a particular investigation or other proceeding, then such staff shall be retained only for the duration of that particular investigation or proceeding.

(i) Outside counsel may be dismissed prior to the end of a contract between the Committee and such counsel only by a majority vote of the members of the Committee.

(j) In addition to any other staff provided for by law, rule, or other authority, with re-

spect to the Committee, the Chair and Ranking Minority Member each may appoint one individual as a shared staff member from the respective personal staff of the Chair or Ranking Minority Member to perform service for the Committee. Such shared staff may assist the Chair or Ranking Minority Member on any subcommittee on which the Chair or Ranking Minority Member serves. Only paragraphs (c) and (e) of this Rule and Rule 7(b) shall apply to shared staff.

RULE 7. CONFIDENTIALITY

(a) Before any Member or employee of the Committee, including members of an investigative subcommittee selected under clause 5(a)(4) of Rule X of the House of Representatives and shared staff designated pursuant to Committee Rule 6(j), may have access to information that is confidential under the rules of the Committee, the following oath (or affirmation) shall be executed in writing: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will not disclose, to any person or entity outside the Committee on Ethics, any information received in the course of my service with the Committee, except as authorized by the Committee or in accordance with its rules."

Copies of the executed oath shall be provided to the Clerk of the House as part of the records of the House. Breaches of confidentiality shall be investigated by the Committee and appropriate action shall be taken.

(b) No member of the staff or outside counsel may make public, unless approved by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee, any information, document, or other material that is confidential, derived from executive session, or classified and that is obtained during the course of employment with the Committee.

(c) Committee members and staff shall not disclose any evidence or information relating to any investigation or proceeding of the Committee or a subcommittee to any person or organization outside the Committee, unless authorized by the Committee.

(d) This rule shall not prohibit the Chair or Ranking Minority Member from disclosing to the Board of the Office of Congressional Ethics the existence of a Committee investigation, the name of the Member, officer, or employee of the House who is the subject of that investigation, and a brief statement of the scope of that investigation in a written request for referral pursuant to Rule 17A(k). Such disclosures will only be made subject to written confirmation from the Board that the information provided by the Chair or Ranking Minority Member will be kept confidential by the Board.

(e) A Statement of Alleged Violation and any written response thereto shall be made public at the first meeting or hearing on the matter that is open to the public after the respondent has been given full opportunity to respond pursuant to Rule 22. Any other materials in the possession of the Committee regarding such statement may be made public as authorized by the Committee to the extent consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives. If no public hearing is held on the matter, the Statement of Alleged Violation and any written response thereto shall be included in the Committee's final report on the matter to the House of Representatives.

(f) Unless otherwise determined by a vote of the Committee, only the Chair or Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, after consultation with each other, may make public statements regarding matters before the Committee or any subcommittee.

(g) The Committee may establish procedures necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any testimony or other information received by the Committee or its staff.

RULE 8. SUBCOMMITTEES—GENERAL POLICY AND STRUCTURE

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of these Rules, the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee may consult with an investigative subcommittee either on their own initiative or on the initiative of the subcommittee, shall have access to evidence and information before a subcommittee with whom they so consult, and shall not thereby be precluded from serving as full, voting members of any adjudicatory subcommittee. Except for the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee pursuant to this paragraph, evidence in the possession of an investigative subcommittee shall not be disclosed to other Committee members except by a vote of the subcommittee.

(b) The Committee may establish other noninvestigative and nonadjudicatory subcommittees and may assign to them such functions as it may deem appropriate. The membership of each subcommittee shall provide equal representation for the majority and minority parties.

(c) The Chair may refer any bill, resolution, or other matter before the Committee to an appropriate subcommittee for consideration. Any such bill, resolution, or other matter may be discharged from the subcommittee to which it was referred by a majority vote of the Committee.

(d) Any member of the Committee may sit with any noninvestigative or nonadjudicatory subcommittee, but only regular members of such subcommittee may vote on any matter before that subcommittee.

RULE 9. QUORUMS AND MEMBER DISQUALIFICATION

(a) The quorum for the Committee or an investigative subcommittee to take testimony and to receive evidence shall be two members, unless otherwise authorized by the House of Representatives.

(b) The quorum for an adjudicatory subcommittee to take testimony, receive evidence, or conduct business shall consist of a majority plus one of the members of the adjudicatory subcommittee.

(c) Except as stated in clauses (a) and (b) of this rule, a quorum for the purpose of conducting business consists of a majority of the members of the Committee or subcommittee.

(d) A member of the Committee shall be ineligible to participate in any Committee or subcommittee proceeding in which such Member is a respondent.

(e) A member of the Committee may seek disqualification from participating in any investigation of the conduct of a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives upon the submission in writing and under oath of an affidavit of disqualification stating that the member cannot render an impartial and unbiased decision. If the Committee approves and accepts such affidavit of disqualification, the Chair shall so notify the Speaker and ask the Speaker to designate a Member of the House of Representatives from the same political party as the disqualified member of the Committee to act as a member of the Committee in any Committee proceeding relating to such investigation.

RULE 10. VOTE REQUIREMENTS

(a) The following actions shall be taken only upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate:

(1) Issuing a subpoena.

(2) Adopting a full Committee motion to create an investigative subcommittee.

(3) Adopting or amending a Statement of Alleged Violation.

(4) Finding that a count in a Statement of Alleged Violation has been proved by clear and convincing evidence.

(5) Sending a letter of reproof.

(6) Adopting a recommendation to the House of Representatives that a sanction be imposed.

(7) Adopting a report relating to the conduct of a Member, officer, or employee.

(8) Issuing an advisory opinion of general applicability establishing new policy. (b) Except as stated in clause (a), action may be taken by the Committee or any subcommittee thereof by a simple majority, a quorum being present.

(c) No motion made to take any of the actions enumerated in clause (a) of this Rule may be entertained by the Chair unless a quorum of the Committee is present when such motion is made.

RULE 11. COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a) All communications and all pleadings pursuant to these rules shall be filed with the Committee at the Committee's office or such other place as designated by the Committee.

(b) All records of the Committee which have been delivered to the Archivist of the United States shall be made available to the public in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 12. BROADCASTS OF COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

(a) Television or radio coverage of a Committee or subcommittee hearing or meeting shall be without commercial sponsorship.

(b) Not more than four television cameras, operating from fixed positions, shall be permitted in a hearing or meeting room. The Committee may allocate the positions of permitted television cameras among the television media in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(c) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the Committee, or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(d) Television cameras shall not be placed in positions that unnecessarily obstruct the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

PART II—INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY

RULE 13. HOUSE RESOLUTION

Whenever the House of Representatives, by resolution, authorizes or directs the Committee to undertake an inquiry or investigation, the provisions of the resolution, in conjunction with these Rules, shall govern. To the extent the provisions of the resolution differ from these Rules, the resolution shall control.

RULE 14. COMMITTEE AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE—GENERAL POLICY

(a) Pursuant to clause 3(b) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee may exercise its investigative authority when:

(1) information offered as a complaint, in writing and under oath, by a Member of the House of Representatives is transmitted directly to the Committee;

(2) information offered as a complaint, in writing and under oath, by an individual not a Member of the House is transmitted to the Committee, provided that a Member of the House certifies in writing that such Member believes the information is submitted in good faith and warrants the review and consideration of the Committee;

(3) the Committee, on its own initiative, undertakes an investigation;

(4) a Member, officer, or employee is indicted or otherwise formally charged with

criminal conduct or is convicted of a felony in a Federal, State, or local court;

(5) the House of Representatives, by resolution, authorizes or directs the Committee to undertake an inquiry or investigation; or

(6) a referral from the Board is transmitted to the Committee.

(b) The Committee also has investigatory authority over:

(1) certain unauthorized disclosures of intelligence-related information, pursuant to House Rule X, clauses 11(g)(4) and (g)(5);

(2) reports received from the Office of the Inspector General pursuant to House Rule II, clause 6(c)(5);

(3) determinations regarding appeals from fines imposed by the Sergeant-at-Arms for the use of electronic devices in contravention of applicable House rules or policies, pursuant to House Rule II, clause 3(g); and

(4) information received from the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights, pursuant to the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995.

RULE 15. COMPLAINTS

(a) A complaint submitted to the Committee shall be in writing, dated, and properly verified (a document will be considered properly verified where a notary executes it with the language, "Signed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on (date) by (the name of the person)" setting forth in simple, concise, and direct statements—

(1) the name and legal address of the party filing the complaint (hereinafter referred to as the "complainant");

(2) the name and position or title of the respondent(s);

(3) the nature of the alleged violation of the Code of Official Conduct or of other law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the performance of duties or discharge of responsibilities; and

(4) the facts alleged to give rise to the violation. The complaint shall not contain innuendo, speculative assertions, or conclusory statements.

(b) Any documents in the possession of the complainant that relate to the allegations may be submitted with the complaint.

(c) Information offered as a complaint by a Member of the House of Representatives may be transmitted directly to the Committee.

(d) Information offered as a complaint by an individual not a Member of the House may be transmitted to the Committee, provided that a Member of the House certifies in writing that such Member believes the information is submitted in good faith and warrants the review and consideration of the Committee.

(e) A complaint must be accompanied by a certification, which may be unsworn, that the complainant has provided an exact copy of the filed complaint and all attachments to the respondent(s).

(f) The Committee may defer action on a complaint against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives when the complaint alleges conduct that the Committee has reason to believe is being reviewed by appropriate law enforcement or regulatory authorities, or when the Committee determines that it is appropriate for the conduct alleged in the complaint to be reviewed initially by law enforcement or regulatory authorities.

(g) A complaint may not be amended without leave of the Committee. Otherwise, any new allegations of improper conduct must be submitted in a new complaint that independently meets the procedural requirements of the Rules of the House of Representatives and the Committee's Rules.

(h) The Committee shall not accept, and shall return to the complainant, any complaint submitted within the 60 days before a Federal, State, or local election in which the subject of the complaint is a candidate.

(i) The Committee shall not consider a complaint, nor shall any investigation be undertaken by the Committee, of any alleged violation which occurred before the third previous Congress unless the Committee determines that the alleged violation is directly related to an alleged violation which occurred in a more recent Congress.

RULE 16. DUTIES OF COMMITTEE CHAIR AND RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

(a) Whenever information offered as a complaint is submitted to the Committee, the Chair and Ranking Minority Member shall have 14 calendar days or 5 legislative days, whichever occurs first, to determine whether the information meets the requirements of the Committee's rules for what constitutes a complaint.

(b) Whenever the Chair and Ranking Minority Member jointly determine that information submitted to the Committee meets the requirements of the Committee's rules for what constitutes a complaint, they shall have 45 calendar days or 5 legislative days, whichever is later, after the date that the Chair and Ranking Minority Member determine that information filed meets the requirements of the Committee's rules for what constitutes a complaint, unless the Committee by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members votes otherwise, to—

(1) recommend to the Committee that it dispose of the complaint, or any portion thereof, in any manner that does not require action by the House, which may include dismissal of the complaint or resolution of the complaint by a letter to the Member, officer, or employee of the House against whom the complaint is made;

(2) establish an investigative subcommittee; or

(3) request that the Committee extend the applicable 45-calendar day period when they determine more time is necessary in order to make a recommendation under paragraph (1) or (2) of Rule 16(b).

(c) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member may jointly gather additional information concerning alleged conduct which is the basis of a complaint or of information offered as a complaint until they have established an investigative subcommittee or the Chair or Ranking Minority Member has placed on the agenda the issue of whether to establish an investigative subcommittee.

(d) If the Chair and Ranking Minority Member jointly determine that information submitted to the Committee meets the requirements of the Committee rules for what constitutes a complaint, and the complaint is not disposed of within 45 calendar days or 5 legislative days, whichever is later, and no additional 45-day extension is made, then they shall establish an investigative subcommittee and forward the complaint, or any portion thereof, to that subcommittee for its consideration. If at any time during the time period either the Chair or Ranking Minority Member places on the agenda the issue of whether to establish an investigative subcommittee, then an investigative subcommittee may be established only by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee.

(e) Whenever the Chair and Ranking Minority Member jointly determine that information submitted to the Committee does not meet the requirements for what constitutes a complaint set forth in the Committee rules, they may (1) return the information to the complainant with a statement that it fails to meet the requirements for what constitutes a complaint set forth in the Committee's rules; or (2) recommend to the Committee that it authorize the establishment of an investigative subcommittee.

RULE 17. PROCESSING OF COMPLAINTS

(a) If a complaint is in compliance with House and Committee Rules, a copy of the

complaint and the Committee Rules shall be forwarded to the respondent(s) within 5 days with notice that the complaint conforms to the applicable rules.

(b) A respondent may, within 30 days of the Committee's notification in clause (a), provide to the Committee any information relevant to a complaint filed with the Committee. The respondent may submit a written statement in response to the complaint. Such a statement shall be signed by the respondent. If the statement is prepared by counsel for the respondent, the respondent shall sign a representation that the respondent has reviewed the response and agrees with the factual assertions contained therein.

(c) The Committee staff may request information from a respondent or obtain additional information relevant to the case from other sources prior to the establishment of an investigative subcommittee only when so directed by the Chair and Ranking Minority Member.

(d) The respondent(s) shall be notified in writing regarding the Chair and Ranking Minority Member's determination under Rule 16(e) or the Committee's decision either to dismiss the complaint or to create an investigative subcommittee.

RULE 17 A. REFERRALS FROM THE BOARD OF THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS

(a) The Committee has exclusive jurisdiction over the interpretation, administration, and enforcement of the Code of Official Conduct pursuant to clause 1(g) of House Rule X. Receipt of referrals from the Board under this rule does not limit the Committee's discretion to address referrals in any way through the appropriate procedures authorized by Committee Rules. The Committee shall review the report and findings transmitted by the Board without prejudice or presumptions as to the merit of the allegations.

(b)(1) Whenever the Committee receives either (A) a referral containing a written report and any findings and supporting documentation from the Board; or (B) a referral from the Board pursuant to a request under Rule 17A(k), the Chair shall have 45 calendar days or 5 legislative days after the date the referral is received, whichever is later, to make public the report and findings of the Board unless the Chair and Ranking Minority Member jointly decide, or the Committee votes, to withhold such information for not more than one additional 45-day period.

(2) At least one calendar day before the Committee makes public any report and findings of the Board, the Chair shall notify in writing the Board and the Member, officer, or employee who is the subject of the referral of the impending public release of these documents. At the same time, the Chair shall transmit a copy of any public statement on the Committee's disposition of the matter and any accompanying Committee report to the individual who is the subject of the referral.

(3) All public statements and reports and findings of the Board that are required to be made public under this Rule shall be posted on the Committee's website.

(c) If the OCE report and findings are withheld for an additional 45-day period pursuant to paragraph (b)(1), the Chair shall—

(1) make a public statement on the day of such decision or vote that the matter referred from the Board has been extended; and

(2) make public the written report and findings pursuant to paragraph (b) upon the termination of such additional period.

(d) If the Board transmits a report with a recommendation to dismiss or noting a matter as unresolved due to a tie vote, and the matter is extended for an additional period

as provided in paragraph (b), the Committee is not required to make a public statement that the matter has been extended pursuant to paragraph (b)(1).

(e) If the Committee votes to dismiss a matter referred from the Board, the Committee is not required to make public the written report and findings of the Board pursuant to paragraph (c) unless the Committee's vote is inconsistent with the recommendation of the Board. A vote by the Committee to dismiss a matter is not considered inconsistent with a report from the Board that the matter is unresolved by the Board due to a tie vote.

(f) Except as provided by paragraph (g):

(1) If the Committee establishes an investigative subcommittee respecting any matter referred by the Board, then the report and findings of the Board shall not be made public until the conclusion of the investigative subcommittee process. The Committee shall issue a public statement noting the establishment of an investigative subcommittee, which shall include the name of the Member, officer, or employee who is the subject of the inquiry, and shall set forth the alleged violation.

(2) If any such investigative subcommittee does not conclude its review within one year after the Board's referral, then the Committee shall make public the report of the Board no later than one year after the referral. If the investigative subcommittee does not conclude its review before the end of the Congress in which the report of the Board is made public, the Committee shall make public any findings of the Board on the last day of that Congress.

(g) If the vote of the Committee is a tie or the Committee fails to act by the close of any applicable period(s) under this rule, the report and the findings of the Board shall be made public by the Committee, along with a public statement by the Chair explaining the status of the matter.

(h)(1) If the Committee agrees to a request from an appropriate law enforcement or regulatory authority to defer taking action on a matter referred by the Board under paragraph (b)—

(A) The Committee is not required to make public the written report and findings of the Board pursuant to paragraph (c), except that if the recommendation of the Board is that the matter requires further review, the Committee shall make public the written report of the Board but not the findings; and

(B) The Committee shall make a public statement that it is deferring taking action on the matter at the request of such law enforcement or regulatory authority within one day (excluding weekends and public holidays) of the day that the Committee agrees to the request.

(2) If the Committee has not acted on the matter within one year of the date the public statement described in paragraph (h)(1)(B) is released, the Committee shall make a public statement that it continues to defer taking action on the matter. The Committee shall make a new statement upon the expiration of each succeeding one-year period during which the Committee has not acted on the matter.

(i) The Committee shall not accept, and shall return to the Board, any referral from the Board within 60 days before a Federal, State, or local election in which the subject of the referral is a candidate.

(j) The Committee may postpone any reporting requirement under this rule that falls within that 60-day period until after the date of the election in which the subject of the referral is a candidate. For purposes of calculating any applicable period under this Rule, any days within the 60-day period before such an election and the date of the election shall not be counted.

(k)(1) At any time after the Committee receives written notification from the Board of the Office of Congressional Ethics that the Board is undertaking a review of alleged conduct of any Member, officer, or employee of the House at a time when the Committee is investigating, or has completed an investigation of the same matter, the Committee may so notify the Board in writing and request that the Board cease its review and refer the matter to the Committee for its consideration immediately. The Committee shall also notify the Board in writing if the Committee has not reached a final resolution of the matter or has not referred the matter to the appropriate Federal or State authorities by the end of any applicable time period specified in Rule 17A (including any permissible extension).

(2) The Committee may not request a second referral of the matter from the Board if the Committee has notified the Board that it is unable to resolve the matter previously requested pursuant to this section. The Board may subsequently send a referral regarding a matter previously requested and returned by the Committee after the conclusion of the Board's review process.

RULE 18. COMMITTEE-INITIATED INQUIRY OR INVESTIGATION

(a) Notwithstanding the absence of a filed complaint, the Committee may consider any information in its possession indicating that a Member, officer, or employee may have committed a violation of the Code of Official Conduct or any law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the conduct of such Member, officer, or employee in the performance of the duties or the discharge of the responsibilities of such individual. The Chair and Ranking Minority Member may jointly gather additional information concerning such an alleged violation by a Member, officer, or employee unless and until an investigative subcommittee has been established. The Chair and Ranking Minority Member may also jointly take appropriate action consistent with Committee Rules to resolve the matter.

(b) If the Committee votes to establish an investigative subcommittee, the Committee shall proceed in accordance with Rule 19.

(c) Any written request by a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives that the Committee conduct an investigation into such person's own conduct shall be considered in accordance with subsection (a) of this Rule.

(d) An investigation shall not be undertaken regarding any alleged violation that occurred before the third previous Congress unless a majority of the Committee determines that the alleged violation is directly related to an alleged violation that occurred in a more recent Congress.

(e)(1) An inquiry shall be undertaken by an investigative subcommittee with regard to any felony conviction of a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives in a Federal, State, or local court who has been sentenced. Notwithstanding this provision, the Chair and Ranking Minority Member have the discretion to gather information pursuant to subsection (a) of this Rule, and the Committee has the discretion to initiate an inquiry upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee, at any time prior to conviction or sentencing.

(2) Not later than 30 days after a Member of the House is indicted or otherwise formally charged with criminal conduct in any Federal, State, or local court, the Committee shall either initiate an inquiry upon a majority vote of the members of the Committee or submit a report to the House describing its reasons for not initiating an inquiry and describing the actions, if any, that

the Committee has taken in response to the allegations.

(3) In addition to any other evidence which the Committee or investigative subcommittee may consider, the Committee or investigative subcommittee may take into evidence any information related to the subject of an investigation contained in trial transcripts and all exhibits admitted into evidence at trial.

RULE 19. INVESTIGATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE

(a)(1) Upon the establishment of an investigative subcommittee, the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall designate four members (with equal representation from the majority and minority parties) to serve as an investigative subcommittee to undertake an inquiry. Members of the Committee and Members of the House selected pursuant to clause 5(a)(4)(A) of Rule X of the House of Representatives are eligible for appointment to an investigative subcommittee, as determined by the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee. At the time of appointment, the Chair shall designate one member of the subcommittee to serve as the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member shall designate one member of the subcommittee to serve as the ranking minority member of the investigative subcommittee. The Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee may serve as members of an investigative subcommittee, but may not serve as non-voting, ex-officio members.

(2) A respondent shall be notified of the membership of the investigative subcommittee and shall have 10 days after such notice is transmitted to object to the participation of any subcommittee member. Such objection shall be in writing and must be on the grounds that the subcommittee member cannot render an impartial and unbiased decision. The members of the Committee shall engage in a collegial discussion regarding such objection. The subcommittee member against whom the objection is made shall be the sole judge of any disqualification and may choose to seek disqualification from participating in the inquiry pursuant to Rule 9(e).

(b) In an inquiry undertaken by an investigative subcommittee—

(1) All proceedings, including the taking of testimony, shall be conducted in executive session and all evidence or testimony produced pursuant to subpoena or otherwise shall be deemed to have been taken or produced in executive session.

(2) The investigative subcommittee, through any of its members or the staff, shall ask the respondent(s) and all witnesses whether they intend to be represented by counsel. If so, the respondent or witnesses or their legal representatives shall provide written designation of counsel. A respondent or witness who is represented by counsel shall not be questioned in the absence of counsel unless an explicit waiver is obtained.

(3) The subcommittee shall provide the respondent(s) an opportunity to present, orally or in writing, a statement, which must be under oath or affirmation, regarding the allegations and any other relevant questions arising out of the inquiry.

(4) The staff may interview witnesses, examine documents and other evidence, and request that submitted statements be under oath or affirmation and that documents be certified as to their authenticity and accuracy.

(5) The subcommittee, by a majority vote of its members, may require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, and other items as it deems nec-

essary to the conduct of the inquiry. Unless the Committee otherwise provides, the subpoena power shall rest in the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee and a subpoena shall be issued upon the request of the investigative subcommittee.

(6) Required testimony shall be given under oath or affirmation. The form of the oath or affirmation shall be: "Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this subcommittee in the matter now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth (so help you God)?" The oath or affirmation shall be administered by the Chair or any individual designated by the Chair to administer oaths.

(c) During the inquiry, the procedure respecting the admissibility of evidence and rulings shall be as follows:

(1) Any relevant evidence shall be admissible unless the evidence is privileged under the precedents of the House of Representatives.

(2) The Chair of the subcommittee or other presiding member at any investigative subcommittee proceeding shall rule upon any question of admissibility or relevance of evidence, motion, procedure, or any other matter, and may direct any witness to answer any question under penalty of contempt. A witness, witness counsel, or a member of the subcommittee may appeal any rulings to the members present at that proceeding. A majority vote of the members present at such proceeding on such appeal shall govern the question of admissibility, and no appeal shall lie to the Committee.

(3) Whenever a person is determined by a majority vote to be in contempt of the subcommittee, the matter may be referred to the Committee to determine whether to refer the matter to the House of Representatives for consideration.

(4) Committee counsel may, subject to subcommittee approval, enter into stipulations with a respondent and/or the respondent's counsel as to facts that are not in dispute.

(d) Upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the subcommittee members, and an affirmative vote of a majority of the full Committee, an investigative subcommittee may expand the scope of its inquiry.

(e) Upon completion of the inquiry, the staff shall draft for the investigative subcommittee a report that shall contain a comprehensive summary of the information received regarding the alleged violations.

(f) Upon completion of the inquiry, an investigative subcommittee, by a majority vote of its members, may adopt a Statement of Alleged Violation if it determines that there is substantial reason to believe that a violation of the Code of Official Conduct, or of a law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the performance of official duties or the discharge of official responsibilities by a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives has occurred. If more than one violation is alleged, such Statement shall be divided into separate counts. Each count shall relate to a separate violation, shall contain a plain and concise statement of the alleged facts of such violation, and shall include a reference to the provision of the Code of Official Conduct or law, rule, regulation, or other applicable standard of conduct governing the performance of duties or discharge of responsibilities alleged to have been violated. A copy of such Statement shall be transmitted to the respondent and the respondent's counsel.

(g) If the investigative subcommittee does not adopt a Statement of Alleged Violation, it shall transmit to the Committee a report containing a summary of the information received in the inquiry, its conclusions and

reasons therefore, and any appropriate recommendation.

(h) An investigative subcommittee may transmit a single report regarding multiple respondents, but shall adopt a separate Statement of Alleged Violation for each respondent where applicable.

RULE 20. AMENDMENTS TO STATEMENTS OF ALLEGED VIOLATION

(a) An investigative subcommittee may, upon an affirmative vote of a majority members, amend its Statement of Alleged Violation any time before the Statement of Alleged Violation is transmitted to the Committee; and

(b) If an investigative subcommittee amends its Statement of Alleged Violation, the respondent shall be notified in writing and shall have 30 calendar days from the date of that notification to file an answer to the amended Statement of Alleged Violation.

RULE 21. COMMITTEE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

(a) Whenever an investigative subcommittee does not adopt a Statement of Alleged Violation and transmits a report to that effect to the Committee, the Committee may by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members transmit such report to the House of Representatives;

(b) Whenever an investigative subcommittee adopts a Statement of Alleged Violation but recommends that no further action be taken, it shall transmit a report to the Committee regarding the Statement of Alleged Violation; and

(c) Whenever an investigative subcommittee adopts a Statement of Alleged Violation, the respondent admits to the violations set forth in such Statement, the respondent waives the right to an adjudicatory hearing, and the respondent's waiver is approved by the Committee—

(1) the subcommittee shall prepare a report for transmittal to the Committee, a final draft of which shall be provided to the respondent not less than 15 calendar days before the subcommittee votes on whether to adopt the report;

(2) the respondent may submit views in writing regarding the final draft to the subcommittee within 7 calendar days of receipt of that draft;

(3) the subcommittee shall transmit a report to the Committee regarding the Statement of Alleged Violation together with any views submitted by the respondent pursuant to subparagraph (2), and the Committee shall make the report, together with the respondent's views, available to the public before the commencement of any sanction hearing; and

(4) the Committee shall by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members issue a report and transmit such report to the House of Representatives, together with the respondent's views previously submitted pursuant to subparagraph (2) and any additional views respondent may submit for attachment to the final report; and

(d) Members of the Committee shall have not less than 72 hours to review any report transmitted to the Committee by an investigative subcommittee before both the commencement of a sanction hearing and the Committee vote on whether to adopt the report.

RULE 22. RESPONDENT'S ANSWER

(a)(1) Within 30 days from the date of transmittal of a Statement of Alleged Violation, the respondent shall file with the investigative subcommittee an answer, in writing and under oath, signed by respondent and respondent's counsel. Failure to file an answer within the time prescribed shall be considered by the Committee as a denial of each count.

(2) The answer shall contain an admission to or denial of each count set forth in the Statement of Alleged Violation and may include negative, affirmative, or alternative defenses and any supporting evidence or other relevant information.

(b) The respondent may file a Motion for a Bill of Particulars within 10 days of the date of transmittal of the Statement of Alleged Violation. If a Motion for a Bill of Particulars is filed, the respondent shall not be required to file an answer until 20 days after the subcommittee has replied to such motion.

(c)(1) The respondent may file a Motion to Dismiss within 10 days of the date of transmittal of the Statement of Alleged Violation or, if a Motion for a Bill of Particulars has been filed, within 10 days of the date of the subcommittee's reply to the Motion for a Bill of Particulars. If a Motion to Dismiss is filed, the respondent shall not be required to file an answer until 20 days after the subcommittee has replied to the Motion to Dismiss, unless the respondent previously filed a Motion for a Bill of Particulars, in which case the respondent shall not be required to file an answer until 10 days after the subcommittee has replied to the Motion to Dismiss. The investigative subcommittee shall rule upon any motion to dismiss filed during the period between the establishment of the subcommittee and the subcommittee's transmittal of a report or Statement of Alleged Violation to the Committee or to the Chair and Ranking Minority Member at the conclusion of an inquiry, and no appeal of the subcommittee's ruling shall lie to the Committee.

(2) A Motion to Dismiss may be made on the grounds that the Statement of Alleged Violation fails to state facts that constitute a violation of the Code of Official Conduct or other applicable law, rule, regulation, or standard of conduct, or on the grounds that the Committee lacks jurisdiction to consider the allegations contained in the Statement.

(d) Any motion filed with the subcommittee pursuant to this rule shall be accompanied by a Memorandum of Points and Authorities.

(e)(1) The Chair of the investigative subcommittee, for good cause shown, may permit the respondent to file an answer or motion after the day prescribed above.

(2) If the ability of the respondent to present an adequate defense is not adversely affected and special circumstances so require, the Chair of the investigative subcommittee may direct the respondent to file an answer or motion prior to the day prescribed above.

(f) If the day on which any answer, motion, reply, or other pleading must be filed falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or public holiday, such filing shall be made on the first business day thereafter.

(g) As soon as practicable after an answer has been filed or the time for such filing has expired, the Statement of Alleged Violation and any answer, motion, reply, or other pleading connected therewith shall be transmitted by the Chair of the investigative subcommittee to the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

RULE 23. ADJUDICATORY HEARINGS

(a) If a Statement of Alleged Violation is transmitted to the Chair and Ranking Minority Member pursuant to Rule 22, and no waiver pursuant to Rule 26(b) has occurred, the Chair shall designate the members of the Committee who did not serve on the investigative subcommittee to serve on an adjudicatory subcommittee. The Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall be the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the adjudicatory subcommittee unless

they served on the investigative subcommittee. The respondent shall be notified of the designation of the adjudicatory subcommittee and shall have 10 days after such notice is transmitted to object to the participation of any subcommittee member. Such objection shall be in writing and shall be on the grounds that the member cannot render an impartial and unbiased decision. The members of the Committee shall engage in a collegial discussion regarding such objection. The member against whom the objection is made shall be the sole judge of any disqualification and may choose to seek disqualification from serving on the subcommittee pursuant to Rule 9(e).

(b) A majority of the adjudicatory subcommittee membership plus one must be present at all times for the conduct of any business pursuant to this rule.

(c) The adjudicatory subcommittee shall hold a hearing to determine whether any counts in the Statement of Alleged Violation have been proved by clear and convincing evidence and shall make findings of fact, except where such violations have been admitted by respondent.

(d) The subcommittee may require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, and other items as it deems necessary. A subpoena for documents may specify terms of return other than at a meeting or hearing of the subcommittee. Depositions, interrogatories, and sworn statements taken under any investigative subcommittee direction may be accepted into the hearing record.

(e) The procedures set forth in clause 2(g)(1)–(4), (6)–(7) and (k) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to adjudicatory hearings. All such hearings shall be open to the public unless the adjudicatory subcommittee, pursuant to such clause, determines that the hearings or any part thereof should be closed.

(f)(1) The adjudicatory subcommittee shall, in writing, notify the respondent that the respondent and respondent's counsel have the right to inspect, review, copy, or photograph books, papers, documents, photographs, or other tangible objects that committee counsel intends to use as evidence against the respondent in an adjudicatory hearing. The respondent shall be given access to such evidence, and shall be provided the names of witnesses committee counsel intends to call, and a summary of their expected testimony, no less than 15 calendar days prior to any such hearing. Except in extraordinary circumstances, no evidence may be introduced or witness called in an adjudicatory hearing unless the respondent has been afforded a prior opportunity to review such evidence or has been provided the name of the witness.

(2) After a witness has testified on direct examination at an adjudicatory hearing, the Committee, at the request of the respondent, shall make available to the respondent any statement of the witness in the possession of the Committee which relates to the subject matter as to which the witness has testified.

(3) Any other testimony, statement, or documentary evidence in the possession of the Committee which is material to the respondent's defense shall, upon request, be made available to the respondent.

(g) No less than 5 days prior to the hearing, the respondent or counsel shall provide the adjudicatory subcommittee with the names of witnesses expected to be called, summaries of their expected testimony, and copies of any documents or other evidence proposed to be introduced.

(h) The respondent or counsel may apply to the subcommittee for the issuance of subpoenas for the appearance of witnesses or the

production of evidence. The application shall be granted upon a showing by the respondent that the proposed testimony or evidence is relevant and not otherwise available to respondent. The application may be denied if not made at a reasonable time or if the testimony or evidence would be merely cumulative.

(i) No later than two weeks or 5 legislative days after the Chair of the Committee designates members to serve on an adjudicatory subcommittee, whichever is later, the Chair of the adjudicatory subcommittee shall establish a schedule and procedure for the hearing and for prehearing matters. The procedures may be changed either by the Chair of the adjudicatory subcommittee or by a majority vote of the members of the subcommittee. If the Chair makes prehearing rulings upon any question of admissibility or relevance of evidence, motion, procedure, or any other matter, the Chair shall make available those rulings to all subcommittee members at the time of the ruling.

(j) The procedures regarding the admissibility of evidence and rulings shall be as follows:

(1) Any relevant evidence shall be admissible unless the evidence is privileged under the precedents of the House of Representatives.

(2) The Chair of the subcommittee or other presiding member at an adjudicatory subcommittee hearing shall rule upon any question of admissibility or relevance of evidence, motion, procedure, or any other matter, and may direct any witness to answer any question under penalty of contempt. A witness, witness counsel, or a member of the subcommittee may appeal any ruling to the members present at that proceeding. A majority vote of the members present at such proceeding on such an appeal shall govern the question of admissibility and no appeal shall lie to the Committee.

(3) Whenever a witness is deemed by a Chair or other presiding member to be in contempt of the subcommittee, the matter may be referred to the Committee to determine whether to refer the matter to the House of Representatives for consideration.

(4) Committee counsel may, subject to subcommittee approval, enter into stipulations with the respondent and/or the respondent's counsel as to facts that are not in dispute.

(k) Unless otherwise provided, the order of an adjudicatory hearing shall be as follows:

(1) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee shall open the hearing with equal time and during which time, the Chair shall state the adjudicatory subcommittee's authority to conduct the hearing and the purpose of the hearing.

(2) The Chair shall then recognize Committee counsel and the respondent's counsel, in turn, for the purpose of giving opening statements.

(3) Testimony from witnesses and other relevant evidence shall be received in the following order whenever possible:

(i) witnesses (deposition transcripts and affidavits obtained during the inquiry may be used in lieu of live witnesses) and other evidence offered by Committee counsel,

(ii) witnesses and other evidence offered by the respondent,

(iii) rebuttal witnesses, as permitted by the Chair.

(4) Witnesses at a hearing shall be examined first by counsel calling such witness. The opposing counsel may then cross-examine the witness. Redirect examination and recross examination by counsel may be permitted at the Chair's discretion. Subcommittee members may then question witnesses. Unless otherwise directed by the Chair, questions by Subcommittee members shall be conducted under the five-minute rule.

(5) The Chair shall then recognize Committee counsel and respondent's counsel, in turn, for the purpose of giving closing arguments. Committee counsel may reserve time for rebuttal argument, as permitted by the Chair.

(1) A subpoena to a witness to appear at a hearing shall be served sufficiently in advance of that witness' scheduled appearance to allow the witness a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Chair of the adjudicatory subcommittee, to prepare for the hearing and to employ counsel.

(m) Each witness appearing before the subcommittee shall be furnished a printed or electronic copy of the Committee rules, the relevant provisions of the Rules of the House of Representatives applicable to the rights of witnesses, and a copy of the Statement of Alleged Violation.

(n) Testimony of all witnesses shall be taken under oath or affirmation. The form of the oath or affirmation shall be: "Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this subcommittee in the matter now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth (so help you God)?" The oath or affirmation shall be administered by the Chair or Committee member designated by the Chair to administer oaths.

(o) At an adjudicatory hearing, the burden of proof rests on Committee counsel to establish the facts alleged in the Statement of Alleged Violation by clear and convincing evidence. However, Committee counsel need not present any evidence regarding any count that is admitted by the respondent or any fact stipulated. Committee counsel or respondent's counsel may move the adjudicatory subcommittee to make a finding that there is no material fact at issue. If the adjudicatory subcommittee finds that there is no material fact at issue, the burden of proof will be deemed satisfied.

(p) As soon as practicable after all testimony and evidence have been presented, the subcommittee shall consider each count contained in the Statement of Alleged Violation and shall determine by a majority vote of its members whether each count has been proved. If a majority of the subcommittee does not vote that a count has been proved, a motion to reconsider that vote may be made only by a member who voted that the count was not proved. A count that is not proved shall be considered as dismissed by the subcommittee.

(q) The findings of the adjudicatory subcommittee shall be reported to the Committee.

RULE 24. SANCTION HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF SANCTIONS OR OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

(a) If no count in a Statement of Alleged Violation is proved, the Committee shall prepare a report to the House of Representatives, based upon the report of the adjudicatory subcommittee.

(b) If an adjudicatory subcommittee completes an adjudicatory hearing pursuant to Rule 23 and reports that any count of the Statement of Alleged Violation has been proved, a hearing before the Committee shall be held to receive oral and/or written submissions by counsel for the Committee and counsel for the respondent as to the sanction the Committee should recommend to the House of Representatives with respect to such violations. Testimony by witnesses shall not be heard except by written request and vote of a majority of the Committee.

(c) Upon completion of any proceeding held pursuant to clause (b), the Committee shall consider and vote on a motion to recommend to the House of Representatives that the House take disciplinary action. If a majority

of the Committee does not vote in favor of the recommendation that the House of Representatives take action, a motion to reconsider that vote may be made only by a member who voted against the recommendation. The Committee may also, by majority vote, adopt a motion to issue a Letter of Reprimand or take other appropriate Committee action.

(d) If the Committee determines a Letter of Reprimand constitutes sufficient action, the Committee shall include any such letter as a part of its report to the House of Representatives.

(e) With respect to any proved counts against a Member of the House of Representatives, the Committee may recommend to the House one or more of the following sanctions:

(1) Expulsion from the House of Representatives.

(2) Censure.

(3) Reprimand.

(4) Fine.

(5) Denial or limitation of any right, power, privilege, or immunity of the Member if under the Constitution the House of Representatives may impose such denial or limitation.

(6) Any other sanction determined by the Committee to be appropriate.

(f) With respect to any proved counts against an officer or employee of the House of Representatives, the Committee may recommend to the House one or more of the following sanctions:

(1) Dismissal from employment.

(2) Reprimand.

(3) Fine.

(4) Any other sanction determined by the Committee to be appropriate.

(g) With respect to the sanctions that the Committee may recommend, reprimand is appropriate for serious violations, censure is appropriate for more serious violations, and expulsion of a Member or dismissal of an officer or employee is appropriate for the most serious violations. A recommendation of a fine is appropriate in a case in which it is likely that the violation was committed to secure a personal financial benefit; and a recommendation of a denial or limitation of a right, power, privilege, or immunity of a Member is appropriate when the violation bears upon the exercise or holding of such right, power, privilege, or immunity. This clause sets forth general guidelines and does not limit the authority of the Committee to recommend other sanctions.

(h) The Committee report shall contain an appropriate statement of the evidence supporting the Committee's findings and a statement of the Committee's reasons for the recommended sanction.

RULE 25. DISCLOSURE OF EXCULPATORY INFORMATION TO RESPONDENT

If the Committee, or any investigative or adjudicatory subcommittee at any time receives any exculpatory information respecting a Complaint or Statement of Alleged Violation concerning a respondent, it shall make such information known and available to the respondent as soon as practicable, but in no event later than the transmittal of evidence supporting a proposed Statement of Alleged Violation pursuant to Rule 26(c). If an investigative subcommittee does not adopt a Statement of Alleged Violation, it shall identify any exculpatory information in its possession at the conclusion of its inquiry and shall include such information, if any, in the subcommittee's final report to the Committee regarding its inquiry. For purposes of this rule, exculpatory evidence shall be any evidence or information that is substantially favorable to the respondent with respect to the allegations or charges before an investigative or adjudicatory subcommittee.

RULE 26. RIGHTS OF RESPONDENTS AND WITNESSES

(a) A respondent shall be informed of the right to be represented by counsel, to be provided at the respondent's own expense.

(b) A respondent may seek to waive any procedural rights or steps in the disciplinary process. A request for waiver must be in writing, signed by the respondent, and must detail what procedural steps the respondent seeks to waive. Any such request shall be subject to the acceptance of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate.

(c) Not less than 10 calendar days before a scheduled vote by an investigative subcommittee on a Statement of Alleged Violation, the subcommittee shall provide the respondent with a copy of the Statement of Alleged Violation it intends to adopt together with all evidence it intends to use to prove those charges which it intends to adopt, including documentary evidence, witness testimony, memoranda of witness interviews, and physical evidence, unless the subcommittee by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members decides to withhold certain evidence in order to protect a witness, but if such evidence is withheld, the subcommittee shall inform the respondent that evidence is being withheld and of the count to which such evidence relates.

(d) Neither the respondent nor respondent's counsel shall, directly or indirectly, contact the subcommittee or any member thereof during the period of time set forth in paragraph (c) except for the sole purpose of settlement discussions where counsels for the respondent and the subcommittee are present.

(e) If, at any time after the issuance of a Statement of Alleged Violation, the Committee or any subcommittee thereof determines that it intends to use evidence not provided to a respondent under paragraph (c) to prove the charges contained in the Statement of Alleged Violation (or any amendment thereof), such evidence shall be made immediately available to the respondent, and it may be used in any further proceeding under the Committee's rules.

(f) Evidence provided pursuant to paragraph (c) or (e) shall be made available to the respondent and respondent's counsel only after each agrees, in writing, that no document, information, or other materials obtained pursuant to that paragraph shall be made public until—

(1) such time as a Statement of Alleged Violation is made public by the Committee if the respondent has waived the adjudicatory hearing; or

(2) the commencement of an adjudicatory hearing if the respondent has not waived an adjudicatory hearing; but the failure of respondent and respondent's counsel to so agree in writing, and therefore not receive the evidence, shall not preclude the issuance of a Statement of Alleged Violation at the end of the period referenced to in (c).

(g) If the Committee issues a report with respect to a claim referred to the Committee by the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights pursuant to Section 416(e) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, the Committee shall ensure that the report does not directly disclose the identity or position of the individual who filed the claim.

(h) A respondent shall receive written notice whenever—

(1) the Chair and Ranking Minority Member determine that information the Committee has received constitutes a complaint;

(2) a complaint or allegation is transmitted to an investigative subcommittee;

(3) that subcommittee votes to authorize its first subpoena or to take testimony under oath, whichever occurs first;

(4) the Committee votes to expand the scope of the inquiry of an investigative subcommittee; and

(5) the Committee or an investigative subcommittee determines to take into evidence the trial transcript or exhibits admitted into evidence at a criminal trial pursuant to Rule 18(e)(3).

(i) Whenever an investigative subcommittee adopts a Statement of Alleged Violation and a respondent enters into an agreement with that subcommittee to settle an investigation, in whole or in part, on which the Statement is based, that agreement, unless the respondent requests otherwise, shall be in writing and signed by the respondent and the respondent's counsel, the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee, and outside counsel, if any.

(j) Statements or information derived solely from a respondent or respondent's counsel during any settlement discussions between the Committee or a subcommittee thereof and the respondent shall not be included in any report of the subcommittee or the Committee or otherwise publicly disclosed without the consent of the respondent.

(k) Whenever a motion to establish an investigative subcommittee does not prevail, the Committee shall promptly send a letter to the respondent(s) informing the respondent(s) of such vote.

(l) Witnesses shall be afforded a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Committee or subcommittee, to prepare for an appearance before an investigative subcommittee or for an adjudicatory hearing and to obtain counsel.

(m) Prior to their testimony, witnesses shall be furnished a printed or electronic copy of the Committee's Rules and the provisions of the Rules of the House of Representatives applicable to the rights of witnesses.

(n) Witnesses may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights. The Chair may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional responsibility on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the Committee may cite the offender to the House of Representatives for contempt.

(o) Each witness subpoenaed to provide testimony or other evidence shall be provided the same per diem rate as established, authorized, and regulated by the Committee on House Administration for Members, officers, and employees of the House, and, as the Chair considers appropriate, actual expenses of travel to or from the place of examination. No compensation shall be authorized for attorney's fees or for a witness' lost earnings. Such per diem may not be paid if a witness had been summoned at the place of examination.

(p) With the approval of the Committee, a witness, upon request, may be provided with a transcript of the witness' own deposition or other testimony taken in executive session, or, with the approval of the Chair and Ranking Minority Member, may be permitted to examine such transcript in the office of the Committee. Any such request shall be in writing and shall include a statement that the witness, and counsel, agree to maintain the confidentiality of all executive session proceedings covered by such transcript.

RULE 27. FRIVOLOUS FILINGS

If a complaint or information offered as a complaint is deemed frivolous by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee, the Committee may take such action as it, by an affirmative vote of a majority deems appropriate in the circumstances.

RULE 28. REFERRALS TO FEDERAL OR STATE AUTHORITIES

Referrals made under clause 3(a)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives may be made by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of the Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 1, 2023, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-487. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31470; Amdt. No.: 4046] received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-488. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31471; Amdt. No.: 570] received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-489. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Normal and Transport Category Rotorcraft Certification [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0990; Amdt. Nos.: 27-51, 29-59] (RIN: 2120-AK80) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-490. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; De Havilland Aircraft of Canada Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1151; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-01603-T; Amendment 39-22303; AD 2023-01-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-491. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GE Aviation Czech s.r.o. (Type Certificate Previously Held by WALTER Engines a.s., Walter a.s., and MOTORLET a.s.) Turbo-prop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1414; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-01303-E; Amendment 39-22304; AD 2023-01-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-492. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0874; Project Identifier AD-2022-00337-T; Amendment 39-22307; AD 2023-01-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-493. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GE Aviation Czech s.r.o. (Type Certificate Previously Held by WALTER Engines a.s., Walter a.s., and MOTORLET a.s.) Turbo-prop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1302; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00062-E; Amendment 39-22301; AD 2023-01-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-494. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0513; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-01162-T; Amendment 39-22241; AD 2022-24-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-495. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Continental Aerospace Technologies GmbH Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1413; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-00077-E; Amendment 39-22302; AD 2023-01-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-496. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Continental Aerospace Technologies, Inc. Reciprocating Engines With a Certain Superior Air Parts, Inc. Intake Valve Installed [Docket No.: FAA-2023-0027; Project Identifier AD-2022-01586-E; Amendment 39-22319; AD 2023-02-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-497. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0991; Project Identifier AD-2022-00155-T; Amendment 39-22299; AD 2023-01-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-498. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0987; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-01416-R; Amendment 39-22298; AD 2023-01-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-499. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1295; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-01181-T; Amendment 39-22295; AD 2023-01-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-500. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Mooney International Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2023-0024; Project Identifier AD-2022-01492-A; Amendment 39-22311; AD 2023-02-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-501. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Union Springs, AL [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1262; Airspace Docket No.: 22-ASO-21] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-502. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1166; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00407-T; Amendment 39-22297; AD 2023-01-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-503. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation Inc. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Cessna Aircraft Company) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-1078; Project Identifier AD-2020-00716-A; Amendment 39-22324; AD 2023-02-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-504. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1050; Project Identifier AD-2021-01257-T; Amendment 39-22316; AD 2023-02-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-505. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1313; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-01418-T; Amendment 39-22317; AD 2023-02-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-506. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0684; Project Identifier MCAI-

2021-01204-T; Amendment 39-22287; AD 2022-27-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-507. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1411; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00912-T; Amendment 39-22320; AD 2023-02-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-508. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Schempp-Hirth Flugzeugbau GmbH Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2023-0162; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-01559-G; Amendment 39-22335; AD 2023-03-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-509. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0812; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00445-T; Amendment 39-22208; AD 2022-21-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-510. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1412; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00805-T; Amendment 39-22314; AD 2023-02-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-511. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Régional Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0396; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-01050-T; Amendment 39-22315; AD 2023-02-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-512. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1298; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00437-T; Amendment 39-22313; AD 2023-02-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-513. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1251; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00588-T; Amendment 39-22308; AD 2023-02-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-514. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0766; Project Identifier 2019-NE-23-AD; Amendment 39-22312; AD 2023-02-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-515. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (AHD) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2023-0159; Project Identifier MCAI-2023-00046-R; Amendment 39-22326; AD 2023-03-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-516. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31469; Amdt. No.: 4045] received February 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of February 27, 2023]

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 166. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 347) to require the Executive Office of the President to provide an inflation estimate with respect to Executive orders with a significant effect on the annual gross budget, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 30) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights" (Rept. 118-4). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. PELTOLA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SORENSON, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms.

CLARKE of New York, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. PORTER, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. NICKEL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. CROCKETT, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. BEYER, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CASAR, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WILD, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. MENG, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. STANTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MRVAN, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. ROSS, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. CHU, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. MANNING, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. BALINT, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. TRONE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MFUME, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SOTO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. RYAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. BUSH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. OMAR, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BROWN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. KAMLAGERDOVE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. CROW, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Ms. PEREZ, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. NEAL, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CARAVEO, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. LIEU, Mr. CASE, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. VASQUEZ, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 20. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 1226. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to allow for the electronic request of certain records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 1227. A bill to modify the age requirement for the Student Incentive Payment Program of the State maritime academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. GUEST, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BUCK, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MASSIE, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. BOST, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. BURLISON, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. CLINE, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mrs. LUNA, Ms. HAGEMAN, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. OGLES, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ROY, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. CARL, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 1228. A bill to prohibit the United States Armed Forces from promoting anti-American and racist theories; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. GUEST, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BUCK, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MASSIE, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. BOST, Mr. STEUBE, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. BURLISON, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. CLINE, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mrs. LUNA, Ms. HAGEMAN, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. OGLES, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ROY, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. CARL, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 1229. A bill to codify Executive Order 13950 (relating to combating race and sex stereotyping), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Accountability, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARSON (for himself, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ROSS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. SOTO, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. TOKUDA, and Mr. CARTER of Louisiana):

H.R. 1230. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants to States to support the establishment and operation of grocery stores in underserved communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 1231. A bill to amend section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 to reaffirm civil rights, victims' rights, and consumer protections; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 1232. A bill to conduct a special resource study of Fort Pillow Historic State Park in Henning, Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 1233. A bill to provide for cash refunds for canceled airline flights and tickets; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLE (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. BICE, Mr. BOST, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. CAREY, and Mr. CLOUD):

H.R. 1234. A bill to prohibit Members of Congress from receiving a financial benefit from certain student loan cancellation programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 1235. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for pay equality and the more accurate computation of retirement benefits for certain firefighters employed by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. CROW:

H.R. 1236. A bill to establish an Outdoor Restoration Fund for restoration and resilience projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina (for himself, Ms. ROSS, Mr. NICKEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CARSON, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 1237. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Sarah Keys Evans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DELUZIO (for himself, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. NICKEL, Mr. RYAN, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1238. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue certain regulations to define high-hazard flammable train, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART (for himself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. GIMENEZ, Ms. SALAZAR, and Ms. MALLIOTAKIS):

H.R. 1239. A bill to designate the area between the intersections of 16th Street Northwest and Fuller Street Northwest and 16th Street Northwest and Euclid Street Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, as "Oswaldo Payá Way"; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. FEENSTRA (for himself, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 1240. A bill to transfer administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal lands from

the Army Corps of Engineers to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, to take such lands into trust for the Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FLETCHER:

H.R. 1241. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information to establish a competitive grant program to assist local governments in providing efficient review and approval of zoning and permitting applications that facilitate the deployment of broadband infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. JACOBS, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 1242. A bill to make improvements to the role of the Department of Defense in responding to domestic emergencies, including wildfires; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Intelligence (Permanent Select), Transportation and Infrastructure, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia:

H.R. 1243. A bill to prohibit no-knock raids from being conducted by Federal law enforcement officers, and other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CARSON, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. BUSH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TRONE, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. ROSS, Mr. KILMER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. IVEY, Ms. MENG, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CASAR, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. OMAR, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. PORTER, Mr. MFUME, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. FROST, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. TONKO, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BROWN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. LIEU, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ

of Texas, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 1244. A bill to posthumously award a historic Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Africans and their descendants enslaved within our country from August 20, 1619, to December 6, 1865; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HAGEMAN (for herself, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. ROSENDALE):

H.R. 1245. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to reissue a final rule relating to removing the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem population of grizzly bears from the Federal list of endangered and threatened wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.R. 1246. A bill to authorize leases of up to 99 years for land held in trust for federally recognized Indian Tribes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Ms. MACE, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. TRONE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. KEATING, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COSTA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. WILD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. ROSS, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. BROWN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. MENG, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. BUSH, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. MOSKOWITZ):

H.R. 1247. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Freedom Riders, collectively, in recognition of their unique contribution to Civil Rights, which inspired a revolutionary movement for equality in interstate travel; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HOYER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, and Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE):

H.R. 1248. A bill to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. MACE (for herself and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 1249. A bill to prohibit certain practices relating to certain commodity promotion programs, to require greater transparency by those programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MANN (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina,

Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER, Mr. MEUSER, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. GUEST, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. MOYLAN, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. SORENSSEN, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BACON, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Ms. PEREZ, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. FINSTAD):

H.R. 1250. A bill to restore the exemption of family farms and small businesses from the definition of assets under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MFUME (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CARSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BROWN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 1251. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Doris Miller posthumously for acts of valor while a member of the Navy during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MFUME (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 1252. A bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Doris Miller, in recognition of his acts of valor while a member of the United States Navy during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia (for herself, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 1253. A bill to enhance the security of the United States and its allies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORELLE (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. GOLDEN of Maine):

H.R. 1254. A bill to direct the President to seek to obtain an agreement between the United States and other countries that have frozen the assets of the Central Bank of the Russian Federation under which parties to the agreement will use such assets to provide for the reconstruction of Ukraine upon cessation of hostilities in Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself and Mr. CLYBURN):

H.R. 1255. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend to Black veterans of World War II, and surviving spouses and certain direct descendants of such veterans, eligibility for certain housing loans and educational assistance administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MRVAN:

H.R. 1256. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the laws relating to the appointment of the Under Secretary of Health and Assistant Under Secretaries of Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1257. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation, acting through the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, to amend certain regulations to require all helicopters and rotorcraft to fly at the maximum altitude permitted by the Federal Aviation Administration in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 1258. A bill to provide adequate protections for gun owners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Appropriations, Veterans' Affairs, Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SANCHEZ (for herself and Mr. ESTES):

H.R. 1259. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an election to expense certain qualified sound recording costs otherwise chargeable to capital account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANTOS:

H.R. 1260. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on the deduction for State and local taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1261. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a corporate responsibility investment option under the Thrift Savings Plan; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself and Ms. SEWELL):

H.R. 1262. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the applicable dollar amount for qualified carbon oxide which is captured and utilized for purposes of the carbon oxide sequestration credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington):

H.R. 1263. A bill to assist employers providing employment under special certificates issued under section 14(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in transforming their business and program models to models that support individuals with disabilities through competitive integrated employment, to phase out the use of such special certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 1264. A bill to streamline the employer reporting process and strengthen the eligibility verification process for the premium assistance tax credit and cost-sharing subsidy; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 1265. A bill to provide further means of accountability with respect to the United

States debt and promote fiscal responsibility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIMMONS (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 1266. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program on using alternative credit scoring information for veterans and members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1267. A bill to protect the rights of passengers with disabilities in air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TORRES of New York (for himself and Mr. LAWLER):

H.R. 1268. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to establish the position of Special Envoy for the Abraham Accords, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H. Res. 178. A resolution affirming the House of Representatives' commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H. Res. 179. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER:

H. Res. 180. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Thomas Garrett was and should be recognized as a national abolitionist leader and activist in the struggle against slavery in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARSON (for himself, Mr. BACON, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. MATSUI):

H. Res. 181. A resolution expressing support for the designation of February 28, 2023, as "Rare Disease Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. IVEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H. Res. 182. A resolution expressing support for America's Black workers and affirming the need to pass legislation to reduce inequalities and discrimination in the workforce; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. CASTEN, and Ms. UNDERWOOD):

H. Res. 183. A resolution expressing support for designation of the third Friday of every March, as "National FIRST Robotics Day"; to the Committee on Science, Space, and

Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas (for himself,

Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BALINT, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CASAR, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. CROW, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. MFUME, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PETERSEN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROSS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H. Res. 184. A resolution recognizing and celebrating the significance of Black History Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mrs. HAYES (for herself and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H. Res. 185. A resolution declaring racism a public health crisis; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MAST:

H. Res. 186. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the People's Republic of China should be held accountable for its handling of COVID-19; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. TOKUDA (for herself and Mr. CASE):

H. Res. 187. A resolution supporting the designation of February 2023 as "Hawaiian Language Month" or "Olelo Hawai'i Month"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALTZ (for himself, Ms. TENNEY, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. ZINKE,

Mr. STEUBE, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. POSEY, Mr. COLLINS, and Mr. SANTOS):
H. Res. 188. A resolution condemning Secretary of Transportation Pete Buttigieg; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XIII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 20.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Labor Law

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 1226.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Modernizing the C-File to make it more accessible to access for veterans.

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 1227.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Education

By Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina:

H.R. 1228.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Critical Race Theory

By Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina:

H.R. 1229.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Critical Race Theory

By Mr. CARSON:

H.R. 1230.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants to States to support the establishment and operation of grocery stores in underserved communities, and for other purposes.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 1231.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Technology

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1232.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

National Parks

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1233.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Consumer Protection

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 1234.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this legislation is to prevent Members of Congress from benefitting inappropriately from student loan cancellation programs.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 1235.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Federal Firefighters pay and benefits

By Mr. CROW:

H.R. 1236.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To establish an Outdoor Restoration Fund for restoration and resilience projects, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina:

H.R. 1237.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Civil rights

By Mr. DELUZIO:

H.R. 1238.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Rail Safety

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART:

H.R. 1239.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill designates the area between the intersections of 16th Street, NW and Fuller Street, NW and 16th Street, NW and Euclid Street, NW in the District of Columbia as Oswald Paya Way.

By Mr. FEENSTRA:

H.R. 1240.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 4 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To transfer administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal lands from the Army Corps of Engineers to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, to take such lands into trust for the Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska, and for other purposes.

By Mrs. FLETCHER:

H.R. 1241.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

Broadband funds deployment

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 1242.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is: Armed Forces and National Security

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia:

H.R. 1243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Restricting the ability of the federal government to partner with the local agencies to perform no-knock raids on law-abiding gun owners.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 1244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

[The Congress shall have Power . . .] To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill will award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Africans and their descendants enslaved within the United States from August 20, 1619, to December 6, 1865

By Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.R. 1245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Natural Resources; removing the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem grizzly bear population from the federal list of endangered and threatened wildlife

By Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.R. 1246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill amends Subsection (a) of the first section of the Act of August 9, 1955, to authorize any federally recognized Indian tribe to lease their land held in trust for a term of up to 99 years.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 1247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Commemorative

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 1248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Care & maintenance of US Capitol premises

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 1249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

OVERSIGHT OF CHECK OFF PROGRAMS

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 1250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Amending the Higher Education Act to exempt family farm and small business assets from FAWSA eligibility.

By Mr. MFUME:

H.R. 1251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 14

The single subject of this legislation is:

Waiving the Time Limitation for Doris Miller to Receive the Medal of Honor

By Mr. MFUME:

H.R. 1252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 6

The single subject of this legislation is: Congressional Recognition for Mess Attendant Doris Miller

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 1253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The single subject of this legislation is:

Energy Security

By Mr. MORELLE:

H.R. 1254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this legislation is international affairs.

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 1255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution. To raise and support Armies . . . To provide and maintain a Navy; To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces; To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To extend to Black veterans of World War II, and surviving spouses and certain direct descendants of such veterans, eligibility for certain housing loans and educational assistance administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and to establish reporting and advisory panel requirements relating to the distribution of such benefits.

By Mr. MRVAN:

H.R. 1256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 allows Congress to make all laws "which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" any of Congress's enumerated powers.

The single subject of this legislation is:

The bill would extend the term to five years for the Under Secretary of Health.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require all helicopters and rotorcraft to fly at the maximum altitude permitted by the Federal Aviation Administration in the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 1258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 and Amendment 2

The single subject of this legislation is:

Ensuring gun owners are afforded due process for the preservation of their Second Amendment rights as it relates to determinations at certain federal agencies.

By Ms. SANCHEZ:

H.R. 1259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To allow independent music creators to deduct 100 percent of recording production expenses in the year they are incurred, rather than in later years.

By Mr. SANTOS:

H.R. 1260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the US Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Section 164(b)(6)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "\$10,000 (\$5,000)" and inserting "\$50,000 (\$25,000)". (Tax Relief)

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 1261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Thrift Savings Plan

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 1262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: The Congress shall have the Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is: create parity between the credit value for utilization and sequestration in the 45Q carbon capture tax credit.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 1263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Fair Labor Standards Act

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 1264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

The single subject of this legislation is:

To streamline employer reporting and strengthen the eligibility verification processes for the premium assistance tax credit and cost-sharing subsidy.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 1265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation makes requirements of the Secretary of the Treasury regarding increases in the debt limit.

By Mr. TIMMONS:

H.R. 1266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Armed Forces and National Security

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 1267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

The single subject of this legislation is:

Transportation

By Mr. TORRES of New York:

H.R. 1268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Foreign Affairs

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. GOODEN of Texas.

H.R. 38: Mr. COLLINS.

H.R. 82: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BACON, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Mr. SANTOS, and Ms. WILD.

H.R. 130: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 146: Mr. SMUCKER and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 163: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 211: Mr. CARL.

H.R. 292: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 319: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 335: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 343: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 347: Mrs. SPARTZ and Mr. SANTOS.

H.R. 353: Mr. LALOTA.

H.R. 354: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 355: Mr. LALOTA and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 396: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 413: Mr. NICKEL.

H.R. 427: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 501: Mr. CISCOMANI.

H.R. 513: Mr. BACON, Mr. ESTES, and Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.

H.R. 558: Mr. GOOD of Virginia.

H.R. 589: Mrs. McCLAIN, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 594: Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 603: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. LALOTA, and Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 615: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BOEBERT, and Mr. DONALDS.

H.R. 619: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 625: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 645: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 662: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 666: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.

H.R. 667: Mr. THANEDAR.

H.R. 713: Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 726: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 735: Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 743: Mr. LALOTA.

H.R. 767: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 790: Ms. LETLOW.

H.R. 797: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 803: Mr. LAWLER.

H.R. 819: Mr. LALOTA.

H.R. 839: Mr. NICKEL and Mr. LAWLER.

H.R. 856: Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. MENG, Ms. BARRAGAN, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 862: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Ms. LETLOW.

H.R. 906: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 930: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 949: Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. Cárdenas, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1010: Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California, Mrs. BICE, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 1014: Ms. PORTER and Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.

H.R. 1047: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. BEYER, Ms. MENG, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PANETTA, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1048: Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MENG, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1049: Ms. NORTON, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1056: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 1058: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 1073: Mr. TONKO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. BOWMAN.
H.R. 1076: Mr. LAWLER and Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER.
H.R. 1083: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1085: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1093: Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1107: Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. HILL, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1140: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 1150: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 1151: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1152: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 1154: Ms. MANNING and Mr. HILL.
H.R. 1159: Mr. HILL and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1171: Mr. SANTOS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, and Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 1172: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1181: Mr. SWALWELL.
H.R. 1182: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

H.R. 1189: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1224: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Ms. PORTER.
H.J. Res. 18: Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.J. Res. 27: Mr. COLE, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Ms. LEE of Florida, Mrs. HOUCHIN, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.J. Res. 30: Mr. FRY and Mr. CLINE.
H. Con. Res. 14: Mr. LATTI.
H. Res. 39: Mr. SANTOS.
H. Res. 90: Mr. HILL and Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Res. 100: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. Res. 108: Mr. BEYER.
H. Res. 114: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. BUSH, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H. Res. 120: Ms. TOKUDA.
H. Res. 154: Mr. MFUME and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H. Res. 158: Mr. DAVIDSON and Mr. STEUBE.

H. Res. 165: Mr. ROY, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, and Mr. GOODEN of Texas.
H. Res. 177: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY Ms. FOXX

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce in H.J. Res. 30 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.